

Bond University

DOCTORAL THESIS

Conceptualising Basic Film Festival Operation :an Open System Paradigm,

Fischer, Alexander

Award date:
2010

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Conceptualising Basic Film Festival Operation: An Open System Paradigm

A dissertation submitted in fulfilment of the requirements
of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
School of Humanities, Bond University

by

Alex Fischer
BComms (SJU), MFTV (Bond)
December 2009

Abstract

The contemporary proliferation of film festivals is the subject of a range of theoretical and practical studies. Yet, currently proposed models are either overly-pragmatic or overly-theorised. To date, there is very little information that explores or seeks to understand those properties representative of basic film festival operation.

Sources required for effective research present subjective and limited accounts of festival functionality; the term *film festival* itself has no official definition; and the language used to discuss film festivals is often ambiguous and metaphorical.

This study proposes that aspects primary to film festival operation be identified and logically linked through established system-based theories. Researchers are then able to establish a foundational comprehension of film festivals and overcome areas that are currently nebulous and detrimental to the field of study.

This thesis advocates a four-phase model of basic film festival operation - the Open System Model (OSM) - that employs established theoretical foundations to designate resource importation as the primary phase of functional festival operation. Subsequent phases involve resource transformation, output, and environmental re-energisation. The determining role of entropy and the necessity for a continual extraction of resources from the environment to assuage its effects are also identified. Eight importation-based strategies designed to increase the likelihood of resource acquisition are posited: *co-operative alliances*, *date placement*, *geographic location*, *identifiable function*, *legitimising affiliations*, *participation-based incentives*, *resource control* and *sanctioning organisations*. OSM is then used to examine specific open system conditions through five original case studies of extant film festivals: Denver International Film Festival, Insect Fear Film Festival, the Shoot Out, Haydenfilms Online Film Festival and Gold Coast Film Fantastic.

OSM is deduced to be an effective and logical means of systematically analysing film festival operation and to be capable of providing the foundational comprehension currently lacking in film festival studies.

Statement of Authorship

This thesis is submitted to Bond University in fulfilment of the requirements for a Doctor of Philosophy. This thesis represents my own work and contains no material which has been previously submitted for a degree or diploma at this University or any other institution. To the best of my knowledge and belief, it contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due acknowledgement is made in the text.

.....

Alex Fischer, December 2009.

for Gringo, Berry, Lindy & the cricket

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Professor Bruce Molloy for his valued assistance as my supervisor: for the insights of his scholarship in the field and his experience as an academic. I am similarly grateful for the support provided to me by Bond University and for the administrative help, encouragement and understanding provided by Dr. Anne Cullen.

I am indebted to many friends for their interest in and support of this project: Jeff Brand; Scott Knight; Helene Forscher; Kwang Kwon; Larry Hsu; Nick Van Tran; Luke Bateup. To Steve Blackey, whose skill as an editor not only helped me crystallise my thoughts but ultimately taught me lifelong skills as a writer: rock on! To my family, Alica, A.J., Lisa, Mom, Dad and Grandma, for their unwavering patience and belief that time taken pursuing personal goals is always time well spent.

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Statement of Authorship	2
Acknowledgements.....	4
Introduction	12
Lack of pre-existing information	12
Speed of research	14
Subjectivity of research	16
Definition of a film festival.....	17
Ambiguous and metaphorical language	20
Film festival practice and theory.....	21
Aims of the current work.....	22
A system-based approach to understanding film festival operation	23
Social systems	24
Film festivals as social systems.....	25
Open system theory	25
Film festivals as open systems	26
The potential for future research	28
Summary of chapters to follow	28
Literature Review and Methodological Considerations	30
Introduction	30
Published sources that contributed to the concept of participation.....	31
Academic sources contributing to the formation of the academic study of film festivals	32
<i>History of the Sydney Film Festival between 1954 and 1983 (2005).....</i>	<i>33</i>
<i>A History of the Sydney and Melbourne Film Festivals, 1945 - 1972: Negotiating Between Culture and Industry (2004)</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>The Organizational Shaping of Collective Identity: The Case of Lesbian and Gay Film Festivals in New York (1996).....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>Film Festival Yearbook: 1 The Festival Circuit (2009).....</i>	<i>35</i>

<i>Dekalog3: on Film Festivals</i> (2009).....	35
<i>Film Festivals from European Geopolitics to Global Cinephilia</i> (2007).....	35
General systems theory resources	36
Organisational theory and social system resources	36
Open system theory resources	37
Methodology of this study.....	37
Practical case study experience	40
Chapter One.....	42
Introduction	42
Film festivals as their own models.....	44
Instructional models.....	47
<i>Problems with instructional models</i>	47
Thematic models	48
<i>International film festival model by Alfred Heintz (1963)</i>	48
<i>International film festival model by the Melbourne International Film Festival (1964)</i>	48
<i>Urban film festival and resort community film festival models by Darryl Macdonald (1998)</i>	49
<i>Agenda-based model by Kenneth Turan (2003)</i>	51
<i>Organisational models of different festivals by SECOR Consulting (2004)</i>	52
<i>Two ideal festival models by Mark Peranson (2008/2009)</i>	53
<i>Problems with thematic models</i>	53
Conceptual models.....	54
Conclusion.....	58
Chapter Two	59
Introduction	59
Systems theory	60
General system theory	61
Social systems	63

Open systems.....	64
Film festivals as systems	65
Film festivals as social systems.....	67
<i>Optimisation of gratification</i>	67
<i>Patterned activity and reactivation</i>	68
Film festivals are open systems.....	70
<i>Film festivals are not closed systems</i>	70
<i>Levels of environmental dependency</i>	70
Open system applications to other social systems	74
<i>Conclusion</i>	74
The value and implications of an open system paradigm.....	75
Chapter Three.....	77
Introduction	77
Open system theory as a model of film festival operation	77
<i>Input – phase 1</i>	83
<i>Transformation – phase 2</i>	84
<i>Output – phase 3</i>	85
<i>Re-energisation – phase 1.n</i>	86
Types and level of involvement.....	91
Timeliness of participation	92
<i>Financially-driven entropy</i>	94
<i>Operations-driven entropy</i>	96
<i>Participation-driven entropy</i>	98
Conclusion.....	100
Disadvantages with the open system paradigm model.....	100
Chapter Four	102
Introduction	102
Strategy one: co-operative alliances	103

Strategy two: date placement	106
Strategy three: geographic location	111
Strategy four: identifiable function	114
Strategy five: legitimising affiliations	118
<i>Organiser-based affiliation</i>	121
<i>Organisation-based affiliation</i>	123
<i>Patrons/official guests-based affiliation</i>	125
<i>Board of directors-based affiliation</i>	128
<i>Sponsors-based affiliations</i>	130
Strategy six: participation-based incentives	132
Strategy seven: resource control	138
Strategy eight: sanctioning organisations	142
Conclusion	146
Chapter Five	148
Introduction	148
Case study 1: Denver International Film Festival (DIFF)	150
<i>Background information</i>	150
<i>Introduction of the film festival</i>	151
<i>Establishment of the Denver Film Society</i>	155
<i>2009 open system condition point identification</i>	161
Case study 2: Haydenfilms Online Film Festival (HOFF)	163
<i>Background information</i>	163
<i>Rationale for study</i>	163
<i>Three importation-based advantages of HOFF</i>	167
<i>Conclusion</i>	172
Case study 3: Insect Fear Film Festival (IFFF)	173
<i>Background information</i>	173
<i>Rationale for study</i>	173

<i>Niche-based, operations-driven entropy</i>	174
<i>Reluctant participation</i>	177
<i>Single source dependency</i>	180
Case study 4: The Shoot Out (SO).....	183
<i>Background information</i>	183
<i>Rationale for study</i>	183
<i>Event development</i>	184
<i>Date placement</i>	186
<i>Geographic location</i>	187
<i>Co-operative alliances</i>	188
<i>Identifiable function</i>	189
<i>Legitimising affiliations</i>	190
<i>Participation-based incentives</i>	191
<i>Resource control</i>	192
<i>Sanctioning organisations</i>	193
Case study 5: Gold Coast Film Fantastic (GCFF)	195
<i>Background</i>	195
<i>Assessment of foundational history</i>	195
<i>Assessment of operational history</i>	202
<i>Open system condition 1 – Failure to re-energise</i>	207
<i>Open system condition 2 – Loss of participation</i>	207
<i>Open system condition 3 – Need to re-design operational structure</i>	208
<i>Open system condition 4 – Stored resources</i>	208
<i>2008 proposed model of operation</i>	209
Strategies utilised	213
<i>Co-operative alliances</i>	213
<i>Date placement</i>	216
<i>Geographic location</i>	217

<i>Identifiable function</i>	217
<i>Legitimising affiliations</i>	218
<i>Participation-based incentives</i>	225
<i>Resource control</i>	225
<i>Sanctioning organisations</i>	226
<i>Outcome and analysis of feedback</i>	228
<i>Co-operative alliances analysis</i>	228
<i>Date placement analysis</i>	229
<i>Geographic location analysis</i>	230
<i>Identifiable function analysis</i>	231
<i>Legitimising affiliations analysis</i>	232
<i>Participation-based incentives analysis</i>	233
<i>Resource control analysis</i>	234
<i>Sanctioning organisations assessment</i>	235
Conclusion.....	236
Chapter Six	238
Introduction	238
Source-based subjectivity	239
Film festival or film market: towards a definition	242
Ambiguous and metaphorical language	246
Future research	248
<i>Negative entropy</i>	250
<i>Information input, negative feedback and the coding process</i>	250
<i>The steady state and dynamic homeostasis</i>	251
<i>Differentiation</i>	251
<i>Integration and co-ordination</i>	252
<i>Equifinality</i>	252
Empirical data	254

Complexity of film festival operation.....	256
Conclusion.....	258
Conclusion	259
Appendices	264
Primary References	266
Secondary References.....	288

Introduction

The twenty-first century's barometer of all things of consequence, Google, lists over 30 million references to film festivals. Some of these references are to longstanding annual events; others are to inaugural events striving for footholds in an increasingly active and cutthroat festival scene. Lying between these two extremes are hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of other events at varying stages of success and failure. Yet to date, no film festival-centred academic studies have presented a model of film festival operation that can be used for an in-depth examination of festival functionality or to predict a festival's operational longevity.

The reasons for this lack are various and will form the initial examination of this study. It is hoped that such considerations as those which this work will propose, will serve to redress this paucity of theoretically sound modelling, and go some way to establishing a basis from which further research may proceed.

To date, no real attempt has been made to produce an analysis of the topic that could provide a one-size-fits-all alternative to the often incongruous information being produced; a model derived from, and applicable to, festivals whose size and complexity range from month-long events attracting tens of thousands of visitors, to small local events whose attendees number in the mere hundreds.

Lack of pre-existing information

To say that there is little in the way of serious scholarship in the area of festival organisation is not to imply that festivals themselves are not, and have not been the subject of much investigation. Indeed, the study of film festivals is a rapidly developing field that is spawning reams of documentary and empirical data. Yet the actual staging, and consequent reporting of festivals and their allied events, is taking precedence over any rigorous analysis of the data they produce, and the research which is taking place appears fractured. The researchers themselves are often isolated from each other and from the breadth of the festival scene, and the conclusions they reach regarding their topics reflects this isolation in a way which particularises their analysis to individual film festivals or inapplicable models.

The study of film festivals occupies an historical vacuum with regards to the amount, quality and type of information available about such events. Julian Stringer (2001) comments that, historically, academic and film industry-based studies of film festivals

have undervalued their importance in the shaping of cinematic movements and trends. Cathy Hope's (2004) examination of the history of the Australian-based Sydney and Melbourne International Film Festivals between 1945 and 1972, notes how film festivals are typically represented as "almost 'empty spaces' in which films were exhibited" (p. 6). She evidences this with the fact that the *Oxford History of World Cinema* (1996) contains little or no information on the organisational history of film festivals, nor on their impact on the film industry. This lack of historical acknowledgement is not limited to academic analysis. Pauline Webber's (2005) extensive examination of the history of the Sydney Film Festival between 1954 and 1983 points out that the role of film festivals in film history is absent from non-academic works. Marike de Valck (2007), too, states that,

[p]ress coverage of film festivals is omnipresent, but it often fails to provide us with an encompassing cultural analysis of the phenomenon that transcends the individual festival editions, both historically and on a contemporary level. (p. 14)

The rationale for harbouring such a perspective is based upon each researcher's claimed primacy of research. These authors identify how previous examinations of film festivals have failed to connect the importance of film festivals with the exhibition of cinema both as an art form and as a commercial enterprise, and thus position the need for their research, and the consequent rationalising of their methodologies, as filling what Webber (2005) calls "a no man's land just outside the usual areas of research" (*Introduction*, para. 9).

The lack of critical theory discussing, or concepts elucidating, film festivals forces researchers to utilise what may be termed raw information. This raw information is understood to be a 'no man's land' of sources because, although it may be found in great amounts, it has never been formally assessed. Information is produced by film festivals themselves, in the form of, for example, press releases, and is generated by film festival participants such as journalists and film critics, yet, paradoxically, while it is voluminous and readily available, this information is generally unusable for academic purposes. This is a fact which Webber (2005) bemoans when she explains that while perusing an anecdotal booklet detailing the history of the Sydney Film Festival she found it to provide "an excellent general overview of the Festival's history", it was "frustratingly silent on some key areas of development" (*A Local Context*, para. 5). Similarly, Hope (2004) is disappointed that the only two sources offering "real" information about the organisational history of her subjects are "intended primarily as celebratory and promotional accounts, and are not a substitute for genuine, critical history" (p. 7). Those sources – *40 Years of*

Film: An Oral History of the Sydney Film Festival (Sydney Film Festival, 1992) and *A Place to Call Home: Celebrating 50 Years of the Melbourne International Film Festival* (Kalina, 2001) – were published by their respective festival organisers and so are obviously less inclined to be critical of their own operation.

One explanation of the difficulty in applying this raw information to academic studies is the lack of formal interpretation that has taken place. That is, while the information published by film festivals provides a wealth of detail, there still remains no way of utilising such information without entering into a detailed and considered rationalisation process as to why particular information is used in a particular manner. Very few authors, Webber and Hope are among them, rationalise the information they use; information which consists primarily of archival documents such as correspondence and the minutes of meetings. Instead, such information is deemed “useful [as] stepping stones”; data which merely “addresses some of the gaps left in the earlier works” (Webber, 2005, *Introduction*, para. 5).

It is important to note that the lack of such exploratory work creates an ‘isolation’ of research. For example, Hope and Webber, who conducted contemporaneous, and almost identical, examinations of the early years of the Sydney Film Festival, never reference each other, and present different sources as the basis for their respective research. This indicates a lack of development of comprehensive and structured channels of research and results in a fractured field of study. In other words, developed, but incomplete areas of research have been undertaken, but have as yet yielded no unified whole as their outcome. As Dina Iordanova (2009) explains, the “study of festivals... is in need of a more systematic and focused approach” (pp. 4-5).

Speed of research

The growth in the publication of film festival information can, to some extent, be attributed to the ease and ubiquity of online publication. Examples of such production include:

- reports by *Variety Online* and other entertainment industry-focused news services;
- material which film festivals themselves produce; and
- articles and blogs written by filmmakers and others.

The reliance upon raw data collected from sources like *Variety Online* places tremendous stress on researchers and their analysis to effectively keep up. *Variety* produces in-depth daily coverage of film festivals such as *Cannes*¹, the *Berlin International Film Festival* and the *Toronto Film Festival* by providing dozens of on-demand, up-to-the-minute alerts, press releases, reviews and videologs. Mark Peranson (2008) explains that in the time it took him to publish a speculative paper, an announcement on *indieWIRE.com* had already confirmed his suspicions of the favouritism that exists between reporters and the film festivals of which they are meant to be critical.

There are thousands of film festival websites, many presenting information about an individual film festival's specific operation. They cover areas such as the programming of films, award winners, sponsors and promotional material, and are augmented by Facebook and MySpace pages, and by Twitter and other social networking tools.

The Filmlot Fest Blog (2006) ranges its commentary on film festivals from presenting jury statements, to explaining why a particular film won awards, as well as programming announcements and film listings. This particular blog represents an interesting information point as it proclaims itself *the* magazine for creative independent filmmakers, and has the potential to influence a particular group's perceptions. Possessing similar potential to influence are those online publications and articles posted by filmmakers. These articles are often personal in nature and describe particularly pleasant or distressing personal experiences regarding festival organisation. Paul Devlin (2008), for example, discusses the concept of a "film festival strategy" (para. 1) and the difficulties he encountered when rushing the post-production process in order to make a film festival deadline.

The efficacy of the online environment for presenting and re-presenting material is also emphasised by Richard Porton (2009b) in his Introduction to *Dekalog3*, a newly published collection of media criticism dedicated to film festivals. He writes that given the hard copy's "long lead time, it is inevitable that certain details will have changed, or are in flux, since the authors initially submitted their articles" (p. 8).

¹ As is noted elsewhere in this Introduction not all film festivals are identifiable by their titles. Some events, such as Cannes, are immediately recognisable to those with even the most basic knowledge of the existence of film festivals. Others, such as Cinemalia require signposting so that the reader is aware that they are indeed film festivals. For the purpose of explication this thesis will on first mention identify such festivals in italics. Subsequent references will be made in standard typeface.

Subjectivity of research

The subjectivity of source material also affects how information has been assessed for the purposes of research. The majority of comments, descriptions and analyses of film festival operation are biased, indicative of a particular individual's viewpoint, and do not represent a general consensus. Chris Gore (2001) identifies “great films, good organization and fun parties” as “three things that matter the most” in making a film festival “enjoyable” (p. 21). These three aspects of film festival operation are obviously subjective to Gore's personal taste both in regard to the function of a film festival and the conceptual understanding of what constitutes ‘enjoyment’. His explanation that “too many festivals get bogged down in other details – seminars, panels” (p. 21) can be considered to be a valid perspective, but such personal preferences should not be used as the sole means of judging film festival operation.

The issue of subjectivity and its potential impact on the public image of film festivals is discussed by other sources. Lory Smith cites his motivation for writing the retrospective *Party In A Box* (1999) as aiming to combat historical inaccuracies about the *Sundance Festival's* origin and to “get it down the way it actually happened” (p. 2). According to Smith, “Sundance [the institute] seemed determined from the outset to rewrite the festival's history as well as its own – to make it seem as if they had rescued a small-time festival from obscurity” (p. 103). It is the implied subjectivity of such a course of action that leads him to conclude that it “is a debate that can never be resolved” (p. 103).

Smith's acknowledgement that discrepancies between viewpoints can defy resolution is a product of film festivals' existence as social systems, a topic we shall return to shortly. There are multiple sides to each film festival story and the closer the author is to the subject, such as those who write personal accounts, the more likely the source will be presented from a perspective indicative of an individual set of beliefs. It is however, important to note that subjectivity is also common among the supposedly objective media. Reporters, journalists and photographers often only document what they deem as ‘newsworthy’ events and information. *Variety* authors Gerald Pratley and Leonard Klady (1998) hold that “there's a fair degree of mythmaking in the history of film festivals, and ironically, given that the journalists historically have been the mainstays of the fest circuit, few facts are recorded” (p. 1).

The impact such ‘mythmaking’ has on the public perceptions of film festivals is well documented. Cari Beauchamp and Henri Behar (1992) describe how a photo shoot in Cannes in 1957 featuring French actress Simone Sylva and American actor Robert Mitchum, forever changed the image of that particular festival. According to the authors, the “international definition of Cannes was permanently sealed” (p. 22) when a

photo of the bare-breasted Sylva entwined with Mitchum flashed over the wires and overshadowed anything else that emerged from that festival. The impact back home in the States was to stamp indelibly the combination of sex and stars as the image of the Cannes Film Festival. (p. 169)

The implications of source-based subjectivity on this study were not fully appreciated when research began. The effects of biased reporting and commentary were revealed only as the investigation became more focused. The most challenging aspect of this subjectivity is that the majority of views about film festivals often only discuss the results of successful collaboration between the film festival and its participants. For example, the attendance of Hollywood stars is often the result of the participatory efforts of distributors using the film festival to promote a title. The propensity for other participants, such as the media, to focus on the end products of participation has the potential to portray these results as having more inherent value to operation than they actually provide.

Definition of a film festival

Subjectivity further manifests itself in the fact that film festivals don’t even have an officially sanctioned and agreed definition. The term *film festival* has an ‘accepted understanding’ rather than a formalised definition that identifies particular characteristics. This presented a problem for this thesis because without a means of identifying what a film festival is it is difficult to determine how one or any should operate. Wikipedia’s (2009) definition of a film festival is a useful starting point:

an organised, extended presentation of films in one or more movie theaters or screening venues, usually in a single locality. The films may be of recent date and, depending upon the focus of the individual festival, can include international releases as well as films produced by the organizer’s domestic film industry. Sometimes there is a focus on a specific film-maker or genre... or subject matter (e.g., gay and lesbian film festivals). Film festivals are typically annual events. (para. 1)

But Wikipedia, for all its accessibility, is not subject to the “systematic rigor” (Loist & de Valck, 2008) demanded by those who call for considered examination of the characteristics that make a film festival a unique organisation.

Though the requirement for a definition of a film festival may seem pedantic and overly critical, the inexactness of the term *film festival* has particular implications for this thesis. First and foremost of these is deciding what actually constitutes a film festival. Even film-orientated organisations, such as the Fédération Internationale des Associations de Producteurs de Films (FIAPF) and the Motion Pictures Association of America (MPAA) provide no official definition of the term.

Commentators and film festival organisers too, seek a definition that moves beyond such generalised definitions. Kenneth Turan (2003) comments that the African-based *FESPACO* is a film festival that “shreds preconceived notions of festivals as merely places where tickets are taken and movies are shown” (p. 65). Similarly, Smith (1999) observes that certain actions performed by film festival organisers made some events “true festival[s]” (p. 27) and Peter Scarlet (in Coyle, 2007) explains that his programming choices are “trying to redefine what a film festival is” (para. 3).

This is not to say that academics and researchers have not attempted to provide working definitions or to point out particular qualities that they feel genuinely reflect what a film festival is. But these attempts suffer the fate of becoming too nebulous and there seems to be a general understanding amongst researchers that in the interest of avoiding further investigation this non-specificity remains unchallenged. The existence of this consensual understanding is mentioned briefly by Webber (2005) when she explains that the Sydney Film Festival “retained, at its core, a sense of what festivals had been in their traditional manifestations - sites of ceremony and ritual” (Ch 4, *Change and New Directions: 1976 -1983*, para. 8).

The issue of understanding what constitutes a film festival is also discussed by Hope (2004) and is of key importance to the historically-based context of her research. According to Hope, “even the Australian film trade – drawing on marketing strategies already utilised in the USA – held what it called ‘film festivals’ in the years prior to Olinda” (p. 11). The placement of the term *film festivals* in quotes can be interpreted as Hope’s reluctance to agree with the Australian film trade’s use of the term. Yet although, the term *film festival* was thus in use prior to Olinda, that event can validly be considered

as the first official Australian international film festival – not only because it screened overseas films, but also because the basic structure for later Australian international film festivals was first implemented there – Hope does not offer an alternative definition.

The problem is exacerbated by the fact that use of the term *film festival* itself does not guarantee that all film festivals will be acknowledged as such. The Italian-based *Le Giornate del Cinema Muto* (*The Days of Silent Film* or *Pordenone Silent Film Festival*), the American-based *Worldfest Huston* and the French-based *Cinemalia*, are all examples of what this thesis (for reasons to be discussed) considers to be film festivals, yet they do not identify themselves as film festivals in their official title, and so may on occasion not be recognised as such.

Caution must also be given to the literalness of *film* within the title. Film festivals utilise various formats – including video – besides photosensitive celluloid. If the term is applied literally then this investigation could only include film festivals that screen films originating from the actual film medium; festivals such as the Polish-based *Warsaw Film Festival*, which is a “showcase for international feature, 35 mm only” (Gaydos, 1998, p. 149); and the American-based *Ann Arbor 16 mm Film Festival*. In an increasingly digitised world, rife with a multitude of media formats, this is clearly not something that should occur.

The decision must also be made as to what events should not be examined by this study. *Film clubs* and *societies*, for example, have different operational structures to film festivals and can be passed over. Yet *film markets* bear a striking resemblance to film festivals and are often held concurrently or as part of them. This has caused a number of authors to include them under the rubric *film festival*, further adding to the confusion. Turan (2003) includes the American-based industry conference *ShoWest* in his book about film festivals. He refers to ShoWest as a “convention” (p. 53), but he also identifies it as a film festival for “people who own movie theaters” (p. 50).

The SECOR Consulting report (2004) commissioned by Telefilm Canada and the Quebec-based cultural funding agency, Société de Développement des Entreprises Culturelles (SODEC), presents information that is helpful in distinguishing between film festivals and film markets:

Unlike film markets, which are reserved for the industry, festivals are generally frequented by a local (and tourist) audience of film buffs for whom this type of

event provides a unique window of access to a host of quality movies, out-of-the-ordinary filmmaking, and diverse cultures and forms of expression. (p. 4)

It is this subjectivity of material that makes the resultant isolation of research so much more challenging to deal with. Each commentator defines a film festival in a manner that best suits their own purpose, and thus contributes to an array of viewpoints, some similar, but without a context that provides a formal understanding of what the events represent. Such a situation makes it difficult to choose one definition over another, potentially perpetuating a problematic hybridisation of ‘accepted’ meanings.

Ambiguous and metaphorical language

Subjectivity becomes an issue again in the ways in which film festivals as events, and their operation, are described in the various sources. Authors, journalists, critics and film festival organisers often discuss film festival operation in a metaphorical fashion that tends to be ambiguous and portrays no exact meaning.

Stylised and descriptive language is so ingrained into the culture of the film industry-specific communication that *Variety Online* has its own “slangology”, a list of terms that *Variety* writers commonly use in their reporting. In such high esteem are the observations and opinions of its writers held, that *Variety* is known as the “show-biz bible” (Ebert, 1987, p. 49). The use of metaphors to explain social forms such as organisations is common and to be expected (Milofsky, 1988, p. 42), but the confusion that results can be frustrating for the serious investigator. Todd McCarthy’s (1998) description of the American-based *Santa Barbara International Film Festival*, for example, as never having “developed sufficient heat to make it a must for out-of-towners” (p. 68), or Peter Biskind’s (2004) description of the 1997 Sundance Film Festival as “a real snoozer” (p. 266) both provide clues as to how participants view and understand film festival operation. Yet while these statements are effective in formulating a general conception of a festival, the challenge lies in deciphering an exact meaning of what ‘heat’ and ‘a real snoozer’ imply about actual festival operation.

In a manner similar to the discussion of disparate definitions of the term *film festival*, this demand for a literalness of language may seem pedantic, and it can be argued that while an author’s exact meaning may not be completely understood an overall tonal impression can usually be gathered. This study concedes that a certain amount of flexibility of language is acceptable, since jargon and other forms of specialised language are to be

expected when examining social organisations. However the opaque character of much figurative speech regarding film festivals is detrimental to the establishment of their study as an academic discipline.

This study encountered a major difficulty with the popular tendency of authors to use metaphorical language to describe both a film festival's operational age and its operational performance. This is especially true when stages of the biological life cycle are referenced. For example, when Ebert (1987) refers to Cannes as being "middle-aged" (p. 107), this description is offered without any additional information, thus leaving it up to the reader to interpret how a 'middle-aged' film festival is meant to operate. Such a description is useless to this study since it reveals no information about either the success or ineffectiveness of the operation of the event.

This ambiguity of referencing is not necessarily the fault of the author, as the stages of biological existence provide an apparently simple means of communicating ideas and are, in fact, endorsed by organisational theorist Carl Milofsky (1988). Webber (2005) notes her reservations concerning anthropomorphisms, but explains that her use of the biological life cycle "nicely describes the historical trajectory of the Sydney Film Festival" (*A Local Context*, para. 18).

Hope's (2004) thesis title, *The Birth of International Film Festivals in Australia*, is used to reference the initial operational stage of the Olinda Film Festival. If 'birth' is to be translated with a biological emphasis, then Hope can be seen to be expressing that this is the exact moment that this particular festival came into being; the moment that the festival became a part of contemporary cinema. Logically, then, it may be reasoned that the idea for the festival may be referred to as its 'conception' and the processes related to its 'fruition' – such as securing a venue and films – its 'gestation'. Yet life cycles do not present the most accurate means of discussing the operational process, for if Hope is instead identifying the appearance of Olinda as the 'birth' of film festivals in general, and that it is therefore the birth of an idea – what has logically been identified here as conception – then what results is an ambiguous point that is not made clearer through metaphor.

Film festival practice and theory

Film festivals are difficult to explain. There is a gap between what is practically known and what is academically understood. These are the hidden aspects of film festival

operation which purposely or not are kept out of public view. The reason for this is the fine line film festival organisers must tread between what Thomas Elsaesser (2005) identifies as “organized chaos” – which can be viewed as the natural state of film festivals due to the flux and volatility of the environment – and stagnation. That is, the relinquishing of creative control in exchange for a degree of stability such as is offered by financial sponsors, can result in a situation where organisers find themselves with no room to move in exercising operational control of an event.

This aspect of film festival operation is rarely written about but rather is found in the numerous interviews and testimonials given by film festival directors. This reliance on oral transmission reflects the hectic process of film festivals operation. Film festival organisers are often too busy organising film festivals to write about their experiences. Yet they are willing to share anecdotal information through conversations and interviews.

It is difficult for any one person to guarantee the successful operation of an event. It generally takes more to facilitate the functional needs of a film festival than being in possession of film industry contacts. In fact, so unique and often unforeseeable are the challenges of operation that Tanner (2009) pleads in *Creating Film Festivals: Everything You Wanted to Know But Didn't Know Who To Ask* that “[n]o liability is assumed for incidental or consequential damages in connection with, or arising out of, the use of the information or programs contained” within her book (p. 2).

Aims of the current work

This, in general, is the current state of play as regards the depth and breadth of research into film festival operation. Information is disparate and directed at particular cases of operation when it is extant at all. The current work seeks to draw these seemingly incongruous bodies of work together in order to provide a generalisable model which would be able to inform not only previous study, but also provide an avenue for future exploration into the presently under-theorised study of film festival operation.

In order to achieve such a synthesis, this work will attempt to align film festival operation with the study of social systems, and more precisely, with Open System Theory, so as to provide an underlying base from which the operation of any film festival can be examined. It is hoped that such a strategy will elucidate and ultimately resolve many of the problems identified above and lead to an understanding that is capable of producing meaningful assessments of festival operation and of highlighting those conditions that

should be met in order to predict and resolve matters of film festival resilience and longevity.

In so doing this thesis will be seen to be contributing new knowledge to a broad but, so far largely untapped body of information. It will also, by situating itself within the theoretical paradigm of Open System Theory, indicate and provide the potential for further and more detailed research into allied matters that, while they would inform and corroborate the matters under discussion here, lie beyond the scope of the current work.

A system-based approach to understanding film festival operation

The use of systems to understand the physical sciences was notably recognised by Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1972) in the late 1920s with what he called “an attempt at an explanation [of] ‘the system theory of the organism’” (p. 410).² This ‘explanation’ would mark the beginning of his General System Theory and later, of Open System Theory, and propose concepts which promoted the application of systems theories to the social sciences, a subject that will be discussed in greater detail later.

Von Bertalanffy defines a system as “a set of elements standing in interrelation among themselves and with the environment” (p. 417). The identification of a system meant that those individuals involved in the physical sciences could construct a logical framework based upon the concept of interrelation. Thus, systems promoted a greater understanding of the connectivity of various aspects of life.³

Film festival operation is systematic. That is, the physical act of operation represents the “assemblage or combination of things or parts forming a complex or unitary whole” (Macquarie, 1997, p. 2150) that is characteristic of a system. This systematic operation is readily observable, from the ‘assemblage’ of programming and attendance of festival guests to the combinatory wholeness of the events themselves, e.g., commencing with an Opening Night and concluding with a Closing Night.

Viewing film festival operation as a system provides a framework in which a more considered understanding of operation as a whole may be acquired; however, the generalised and all-encompassing nature of the definition of a system does not address the

² Von Bertalanffy (1972) explains that the “notion of a system is as old as European philosophy” (p. 407) as the Greeks came to understand the world operated in an intelligible manner.

³ To this effect von Bertalanffy (1972) identifies “a galaxy, a dog, a cell and an atom” all as systems (p. 421).

more detailed aspects specific to film festival functionality. The following will continue to examine film festival operation as a system, but it will do so through a narrowing of the focus on the prerequisites of operation. At the conclusion of this brief examination the components that are critical to the system-based operation of a film festival will be identified and a specific model of operation designated.

Social systems

As previously mentioned, von Bertalanffy promoted the application of system theory to the social sciences. Through his development of Systems Philosophy, von Bertalanffy (1972) distinguishes three types of systems which will be of value to this thesis in a later chapter:

- real systems;
- conceptual systems;
- abstracted systems. (pp. 421-422)

It can be reasoned that the subjects of social sciences, such as organisations and institutions, represent real systems since the interaction between the actors⁴, i.e., individuals and groups, are as easy to observe as those that take place in a physical scientific reaction. In fact, Talcott Parsons (1951) identifies this interaction as the “fundamental starting point” of social systems of action, and states that it is “possible to treat such a process of interaction as a system in the scientific sense, and subject it to the same order of theoretical analysis which has been successfully applied to other types of systems in other sciences” (p. 3). This is, however, the extent of the similarity as the interactions that occur within biological and chemically-based systems are known to be based upon the logic of physical reactions, whereas social systems are based upon the motivation of the actors.

In order to gain an understanding of the type of interaction indicative of social systems the following definition by Parsons (1951) is used:

Reduced to the simplest possible terms... [the social system] consists in a plurality of individual actors interacting with each other in a situation which has at least a physical or environmental aspect, actors who are motivated in terms of a tendency to the ‘optimization of gratification’ and whose relation to their situations,

⁴ ‘Actor’ is a specific part of systems theory terminology and signifies individuals, groups or other elements involved in systematic processes. It should not be confused with those ‘actors’ of the thespian variety who are so prevalent in the film festival scene.

including each other, is defined and mediated in terms of a system of culturally structured and shared symbols. (pp. 5-6).

Film festivals as social systems

Film festivals can be identified as social systems because the interaction they have with actors, e.g., distributors, filmmakers, etc, is based upon this concept of motivation. That is, a particular filmmaker's decision to enter a film into a festival is not a physical reaction following predictable cause and effect sequences but is, rather, a choice that is made. Parsons (1951) explains that the decisions necessary for an actor to become involved are not "ad hoc responses to particular situational stimuli but that the actor develops a *system* of 'expectations' relative to the various objects of the situation" (p. 5).

Herein lies a further opportunity to refine the understanding of film festival operation. Having noted that social systems differ from other science-based systems, e.g., the biological, because the interaction is based upon a conscious decision and not a physical reaction, this study may consequently examine to what extent the interaction of other actors within film festival operation is required for functionality. Such an examination is congruent with Parsons' understanding that it is the "*participation* of an actor in the patterned interactive relationship which is for many purposes the most significant unit of the social system" (p. 25, italics in original).

Open system theory

Participation is a key concept of Open System Theory (OST). The history of OST can again be traced to the 1920s when von Bertalanffy (1972) first proposed the concept of "organismic biology" (p. 410). This proposal endeavoured to apply the same co-ordination of parts and process observed to occur in living organisms to all systems. From this 'organismic biology', General System Theory (GST) was developed as "a logical mathematical field whose task is the formulation and derivation of those general principles that are applicable to 'systems' in general" (p. 411).

The concept of an open system arose when von Bertalanffy began to develop his ideas so as to explain the irreversible processes common in physical chemistry. His observations noted that certain reactions resulted only when an "exchange" occurred between a system and the environment, and that this exchange was understood to be irreversible, e.g., the release of heat in a chemical reaction (p. 412). Indeed an open system is defined as "a system that interacts with the external environment" (Daft, 1997, p. 55). In

fact OST and GST are so fundamentally similar that Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn (1978) contend that “general systems theory should be open systems theory” (p. 8). The concept of OST and GST proved to be such an effective means of examining the systematic responses found in physical chemistry, biophysics and general biology that Katz and Kahn extend the concept of an open system to evidence its applicability to organisations.

Organisations as a special class of open system have properties of their own, yet they also share properties in common with all open systems. The following lists ten characteristics that Katz and Kahn explain “define all open systems” (pp. 23-30):

1. Importation of energy.
2. The throughput of energy.
3. The output of energy.
4. Systems as cycles of events.
5. Negative Entropy.
6. Information input, negative feedback and the coding process.
7. The steady state and dynamic homeostasis.
8. Differentiation.
9. Integration and Co-ordination.
10. Equifinality.

Open System Theory (OST) is a multi-disciplinary conceptualisation of the interaction a system has with its external environment (Daft, 1997, p. 55). For example, the concept of entropy, which is the irreversible process that occurs as resources from the environment are transformed through operation, becomes a logical factor associated with systemic failure.

Film festivals as open systems

Film festivals can be viewed as open systems because their operational capabilities are dependent upon the successful importation of certain resources that can only be acquired from the environment. These resources include, but are not limited to, films, filmmakers, funding, audience members and the media. While it is possible for a film festival to internally generate elements that resemble these resources – film festivals often produce press releases, for example – these elements are not enough to sustain film festival activity. It can therefore be concluded that without external participation film festivals

would enter into operational failure. The degree of dependency upon external resources required to operate a fully functional film festival is extremely high. For example, Cannes requires a huge volume of diverse external actors in order to function at its optimum level; conversely, a community film festival showcasing local films can successfully operate with the involvement of very few.

Regardless of this input variation, all film festivals require external interaction in order to function, and this conforms to Parsons' (1951) concept of participation and the fact that external interaction is the critical element that enables social systems to operate. Film festivals therefore represent a special type of social system because their operational needs are almost entirely dependent upon their environment. From this deduction it can be argued that an open system model represents the basic and primary operational structure of film festivals.

The systematic operation of film festivals fails when the external participation of resource providers does not occur. This too, conforms to Parson's contentions regarding the identification of a social system:

The obverse of the functional prerequisite of meeting a minimum proportion of the needs of the individual actors is the need to secure adequate participation of a sufficient proportion of these actors in the social system, that is, to motivate them adequately to the performances which may be necessary if the social system in question is to persist or develop. Indeed it is because it is a condition of this that the need to satisfy minimum needs of actors is a prerequisite at all. (p. 29)

Film festivals are also susceptible to 'disorganisation'. There are no guarantees that a film festival will receive the resources it needs for operation due to the fact the resources may not be physically accessible. The geographical distance of the early Australian film festivals, for example, made the programming of overseas films difficult (Webber, 2005; Hope, 2004). Factors such as long transit times, miscommunication and broken promises meant that the Australian film festivals could not ensure the physical delivery of films in time for operation. Hope contends that this situation forced the film festival organisers to select films according the "primary criterion" of "were they [the films] here [in Australia], or did they look like arriving?" (p. 14).

Viewing film festivals in the light of these correlations is illuminating to the assessment of film festival operation both in terms of analysing existing festivals to test for

resilience and gauge their potential longevity, and also as a means of structuring the organisation of new and proposed events so as to ensure that they maximise their chances of success.

The potential for future research

An open system model provides a logical and predictive means of understanding film festival operation. Its application to film festival studies will create a base from which the isolated and fractured nature of current research may be consolidated and made more cohesive. There is also the potential for future research which includes but is not limited to the following:

- The further application of OST to more specific and complex aspects related to operational functionality that are beyond the scope of this study, e.g., the point at which the number of film festivals physically operating reaches saturation and its consequent impacts on the ability of film festival organisers to successfully engage the external actors needed for operation.
- An examination of the complexity of operation. That is, how the participation of certain actors is detrimental to the functionality of a film festival.
- The potential appearance of non-conventional film festival models, e.g., those that have the ability to effectively generate their own operational resources.

Summary of chapters to follow

The structure of this thesis aims to be linear, logical and cumulative. To this end the following outline is provided to indicate the sequential flow of the argument for the reader.

Chapter One will continue the discussion commenced above and discuss at length the models and theoretical standpoints of the various researchers into film festival organisation.

Chapter Two will expand on the notion presented above of film festivals as open systems by tracing the corresponding points of operation between OST and film festival organisation.

Chapter Three will propose a four-phase, linear model of basic film festival operation based upon select, ‘primary’ characteristics of OST. This four-phase model is referred to as the Open System Model (OSM). Also discussed in this chapter will be the

functional role entropy plays both in determining the timeliness and degree of external participation required to promote/sustain film festival operation.

Chapter Four will expand upon OSM, presenting methods in which film festival organisers are able to increase the likelihood of resource importation through the implementation of eight specific strategies. The formalisation of these strategies is unique to this thesis and constitutes new knowledge with regard to their formal identification, rationalisation and application to the field of film festival study.

Chapter Five will demonstrate the applicability and effectiveness of OSM in determining the operational longevity of film festivals through a two-part case study analysis. Part one examines the open system conditions of four film festivals that are varied in size, structure and focus. Part two is a unique case study conducted by the author who had the opportunity to observe and apply the proposed model during the organisation of a film festival in Australia. It is believed that this is the first time that such a recounting of the actual process of film festival organisation – from within the operational structure itself – has been undertaken, and that this can be seen as a significant contribution of new knowledge to this expanding field of study.

Chapter Six will conclude this study by presenting its original contributions which include a means of addressing subjective-based resources, of moving towards a definition of the term *film festival*, and of formalising the language used to discuss film festival operation as a whole. This chapter will also indicate how OST, OSM, and social system theory offer a fertile ground from which to develop further scholarship and will indicate those avenues of study which are deemed to be of significant and pressing concern.

The study will be rounded out in its **Conclusion** by a restatement of the major points of this thesis and a general statement of the future of film festival operation and its study.

Additionally, a number of **Appendices** contain much of the primary information on which the included case studies were based, in the form of interviews conducted with the various film festival organisers and select film industry professionals.

Literature Review and Methodological Considerations

Introduction

The vast majority of information in this study was taken from Internet-based sources and includes, but is not limited to, film festival websites, testimonial blogs and databases. Mention has been made of the rise of online publication and the author has relied heavily on an extensive collection of *Variety Online* articles from 2003 to 2007 which he has undertaken to assemble in order to provide contextual background to film festival operation.

In addition to Internet sources, reference was also made to a number of books published about film festivals. These range from film festival guidebooks such as Chris Gore's *The Ultimate Film Festival Survival Guide* (2001) and Lauri Tanner's (2009) *Creating Film Festivals: Everything You Wanted to Know but Didn't Know Who to Ask*, to in-depth narratives that recount the origins of some of the most well-known film festivals, such as, Sundance (Smith, 1999), Cannes (Beauchamp & Behar, 1992; Biskind, 2005; Ebert, 1987; Bart, 1997; Walker, 2000) and the Toronto International Film Festival (Johnson, 2000).

Not all of the sources used represent raw information and this study uncovered numerous academic articles and papers that provide insightful analysis. For example, the influence film festivals have on national filmmaking, specifically African films and filmmaking (Barlet, 1996; Bangré, 1994); the relationship between women's films festivals and women's rights in Taiwan (Huang, 2003); and the impact Western film festival audience-based expectations have on Chinese film production (Zhang, 2002). Similarly, analysis has been conducted on the geopolitics of film festivals (Stringer, 2001; Rich, 2003).

This research also uncovered a number of sources dedicated to the historical analysis of film festivals. The work of Marla Stone, whose articles "Challenging Cultural Categories: The Transformation of the Venice Biennale Under Fascism" (1999) and "The Last Film Festival: the Venice Biennale Goes to War" in the book *Re-Viewing Fascism: Italian Cinema, 1922-1943* (2002) discuss the functions of the Venice International Film Festival as a political tool of the Fascist Italian government in the 1930s, has provided much valuable material for consideration. So too, has Raymond Haberski's (2001) article "It's Only a Movie", on the origin of the *New York Film Festival*.

Published sources that contributed to the concept of participation

As previously mentioned, film festivals are viewed by this study to be social systems and so the interaction that takes place within and around them is based upon participation. This participation does not occur naturally but rather is the result of an individual actor's motivation. In order to address the issue of motivation, which is an individual and highly personalised process, a number of sources were used to gain an intimate 'insider's' point of view of film festival operation and enable a more considered knowledge base from which to formulate ideas related to participation

A selected list of these sources includes *Two Weeks in the Midday Sun: A Cannes Notebook* (Ebert, 1987) which chronicles the day-to-day experiences of one the world's leading film critics, Roger Ebert, at the Cannes International Film Festival. This book, written in the first person, provides valuable insight and was used to develop an understanding of the attitudes and beliefs that influence the participation of critics; *Hollywood on the Riviera: The Inside Story of the Cannes Film Festival* (1992) by Beauchamp and Behar is based on over a hundred interviews with "Cannes veterans" (p. 15). The stated objective of the book is to "catch the essence" (p. 15) of what festivals mean to those who have participated and ultimately contributed to the relationship patterns that for decades, have influenced the conditions of interaction between film festivals and their external actors.

Additional festival historical narratives surveyed include: *Cannes: Fifty Years of Sun, Sex & Celluloid: Behind the Scenes at the World's Most Famous Film Festival* (Bart, 1997) and *Party in a Box: The Story of the Sundance Film Festival* (Smith, 1999).

Filmmaker specific books such as *Ultimate Film Festival Survival Guide* (Gore, 2001), *The Film Festival Guide* (Langer, 2000), *International Film Festival Guide* (Stolberg, 2000) and *King of Cannes: Madness, Mayhem and the Movies* (Walker, 2000), provide information specifying the filmmakers' perspective. These works range in the depth and degree of their insight from providing festival 'horror stories', to detailing the importance of developing a film festival strategy when submitting an unsolicited entry.

Not all sources were anecdotal: an analysis commissioned by Telefilm Canada, a subsidiary of the Canadian Government and SODEC, the cultural arm of the State Government in Québec, and aimed at providing the "public partners that financially support these events with an analytical framework that will allow them to evaluate the

impact of their film festival investments on a regular basis” (SECOR, 2004, p. 12) provides a pragmatic assessment of the operational requirements film festivals *should* have before public funding is allocated; similarly, the International Federation of Film Producers Association (FIAPF) generated material which includes an extensive *Accredited Festivals Directory* that outlines the requirements of affiliation, and identifies its commitment as a “regulator of international film festivals” (FIAPF, 2009, para. 2).

Film commission websites were also consulted, though the majority of the websites surveyed had little or no information about film festivals. The two most developed sites were from Screen Australia (2009) and the Canadian-based Telefilm (2009).

Screen Australia has a webpage titled “Marketing Your Film” which contains “profiles” of over fifty international film festivals including their location, genre, deadline and information about any previous Australian films that have screened at a particular film festival. Telefilm Canada (2009) acknowledges the importance of film festivals in a similar way. The website explains that, “[f]estivals and international markets for audiovisual and new media products are favourite promotional opportunities”. Telefilm Canada also identifies international film festivals as having “built the reputation of Canadian cinema and the careers of its talent around the world”. And Telefilm itself “sees to it that Canadian productions are represented at more than three hundred Canadian festivals and foreign events” (para. 1).

Academic sources contributing to the formation of the academic study of film festivals

Skadi Loist and Marike de Valck (2008) claim in their online annotated bibliography that it “is no longer possible to maintain that there are no comprehensive studies of film festivals available” (*Film Festival Theory*, para. 1). This statement is particularly valid now, as the past four years have seen the publication of a number of theses, as well as academically-minded books specific to film festivals. This is a drastically different situation to that which confronted the author when the research for the present study began in 2003. At that time the majority of analyses on film festival operation were generally limited to anecdotal chapters in the aforementioned guide books.

In addition to the appearance of these publications there is also the development of a group of academics focusing solely upon film festivals as subjects. The Film Festival Research Network (FFRN) is a loose affiliation of scholars working on issues related to

film festivals. According to its founders, Loist and de Valck (2008), the FFRN “aims to make festival research more available and connect diverse aspects and interdisciplinary exchange between researchers” (*Contact/Bio*, para. 1). The formation of this group demonstrates a maturation of the field and is an indicator that film festival studies is perhaps headed in a similar direction to that of Event Studies.⁵

A relatively new discipline, Event Studies has already generated a number of published works that not only identify the components of operation, but also those institutions that offer advanced studies on the subject, i.e., courses in event management. The creation of FFRN also presents a viable alternative to Internet-based networks such as *filmfestivals.com*. While these networks have proven to be valuable resources, and have been known to post articles of merit regarding film festivals, they are not sites dedicated to academic work, and thus information is generally pedestrian and offers little in the way of actual critical analysis.

The following will identify and summarise those articles, books and theses that have been of particular importance to this thesis.

History of the Sydney Film Festival between 1954 and 1983 (2005)

Webber’s Masters thesis investigates the functional role of film festivals and the impact they have upon contemporary cinema and their individual environments. The information she presents provides a basis for understanding the fundamentals of interaction between a film festival and its participants. She identifies the motivation for her examination as a “desire to find out where film festivals, and the Sydney Film Festival specifically, fit into the Australian ‘film culture infrastructure’” (Introduction, *A Local Context*, para. 3). This desire to investigate a film festival’s influence on ‘film culture infrastructure’ led Webber to a remarkable conclusion. She observes that the organisers of the Sydney Film Festivals have continually changed that event’s operational structure in order to best work within both the local and international environment (*A Local Context*, para. 19). This conclusion has important implications for this study as it acknowledges the influence the environment has on film festival operation (a characteristic of an open system). Webber also discusses the structural changes that occur during film festival

⁵ The growing Event Studies field has encouraged “a group of academics and practitioners” to develop “the Event Management Body of Knowledge or EMBOK” (Getz, 2007, p. 4). EMBOK (n.d.) is analogous to FFRN in that its aim is “to create a framework of the knowledge and processes used in event management that may be customized to meet the needs of various cultures, governments, education programs, and organizations” (para. 3).

operation and notes how the Sydney Film Festival “metamorphosed from a small scale amateur event to an established corporate entity” (*A Local Context*, para. 19).

A History of the Sydney and Melbourne Film Festivals, 1945 - 1972: Negotiating Between Culture and Industry (2004)

Hope explains that her PhD thesis is “an exercise in what could be called ‘micro-history’” (p. 1). The study chronicles

the organisational history of the Sydney and Melbourne International Film Festivals, and moves from their origins in the post-war film society movement in Australia, to the early 1970s – by which time the Festivals had succeeded in becoming two of the premier social and cultural events in the country. (p. 1)

Central to Hope’s argument are the challenges both Sydney and Melbourne Film Festival organisers faced when having to adhere to the participation-based requirements of resource providers with conflicting social system beliefs; a subject identified by this study as being worthy of further investigation through an open system paradigm.

Hope contends that while “the Festivals were responsive to the need to maintain their cultural legitimacy – as exhibitors of non-mainstream ‘quality’ cinema promoters of ‘film culture’ in general” – they were also “subject to various demands from the commercial cinema trade, both international and domestic” (p. 1).

Hope is one of very few authors to have investigated this topic. Though she admits her examination is limited due to the specific nature of her subject, the fact that she attempts, and is able, to make headway in terms of analysis, has enabled this study to complement her findings through the presentation of a model of film festival operation that will enable external actors to be placed in a hierarchical order based upon the perceived necessity of their involvement.

The Organizational Shaping of Collective Identity: The Case of Lesbian and Gay Film Festivals in New York (1996)

Joshua Gamson’s article examines the concept of legitimacy and its importance in procuring resources from the environment. Similarly to Webber, he analyses how his subject film festivals have changed to accommodate to their environment. His analysis discusses “the ways each organization has faced the related challenges of community

legitimacy, which requires racial diversification and organizational survival within an altered institutional environment” (pp. 235-236).

Gamson’s research has specific implications for this study in that he provides valuable insight into the institutional and participant-driven ‘rules’ of operation, and the influence they have on viable film festival operation.

Film Festival Yearbook: 1 The Festival Circuit (2009)

Edited by Dina Iordanova and Ragan Rhyne and published in early 2009, this resource contains four specifically focused topics of examination: The Festival Circuit, Festival Case Studies, Dispatches from the Festival World and the Field of Festival Studies. The individual chapters are authored by academics or particularly experienced film festival practitioners. The varying skills and expertise of these contributors add to the well-rounded nature of the work as a whole. According to the editors, the aim of the work is to “put the study of film festivals on a systematic footing, consolidate existing strands of work, and build bridges between the communities of scholars and festival practitioners through a single annual collection of the best festival research” (p. 3). And this is something it comes close to achieving.

Dekalog3: on Film Festivals (2009)

Dekalog is a bi-annual publication that identifies itself on its title page as “the new home for serious film criticism”. The book presents information on film festivals in four topical areas: A Backwards Glance, Film Festivals: between Art and Commerce, Memoirs and Case Studies, The Filmmakers’ Perspective. Editor Richard Porton, states that the publication is meant to

offer a distinctive alternative to the largely pedestrian film festival reports found in newspapers and even film magazines – as well as the decidedly uneven commentary on film festivals that has appeared in book form in recent years. (p. 2)

Porton’s criticism of these books is indicative of problems pertaining to subjectivity discussed in the Introduction. Unlike *Film Festival Yearbook 1* this publication utilises the expertise of critics such as Robert Koehler, Adrian Martin and Jonathan Rosenbaum.

Film Festivals from European Geopolitics to Global Cinephilia (2007)

This book derives from Marijke de Valck’s PhD thesis and “aims to offer a comprehensive introduction to the film festival phenomenon”, including “both a historical

overview of the development film festivals and a cultural assessment of the workings of the present-day international film festival circuit” (p. 14).

De Valck’s insight is impressive and her application of Network Theory and Actors Network Theory marks one of the first comprehensive models employed to understand film festival operation. De Valck’s findings are at a decidedly advanced level of comprehension and it is believed that the open system model proposed by this thesis complements and strengthens her work. This will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.

General systems theory resources

As previously mentioned, General System Theory (GST) is commonly equated with Open System Theory (OST) because they share the same theory-based roots. Thus the majority of information about GST is used to formulate the historical perspective of OST. This information is taken from Ludwig von Bertalanffy: *An Outline of General System Theory* (1950), *General Systems Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications* (1968) and *The History and Status of General Systems Theory* (1972). In addition to von Bertalanffy, the work of Kenneth Boulding (1956) is also consulted.

Organisational theory and social system resources

Charles-Clemens Rüling (2009) notes that “[p]ublished research on film festivals from an organizational perspective is scarce” (p. 50). The insight enabling the present work to construct a reliable comprehension of the organisational and therefore social systems-based aspects of film festival operation, especially those indicative of participation, is gained from the analysis of a range of sources. The majority of theoretical information is taken from *The Social System* (Parsons, 1951), *Organizational Environments* (Meyer & Scott, 1983) and *Community Organizations: Studies in Resource Mobilization and Exchange* (Milofsky, 1988). Articles such as “The Effects of Formal Structure on Managerial Recruitment: A Study of Baseball Organizations” (Grusky, 1963) and “Institutional Sources of Change in the Formal Structure of Organizations: The Diffusion of Civil Service Reform, 1880-1935” (Tolbert & Zucker, 1983) also contributed by presenting case studies that enabled this study to confidently identify and apply theories such as Formal Structure, an area of particular importance for this study when discussing the participation of funding and sanctioning organisations.

Open system theory resources

This thesis uses the principles of Open System Theory (OST) as they are comprehensively applied to social systems by Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn in the revised edition of their seminal work *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (1978). In support of this source several practically-based publications such as *An Open-Systems Perspective on Urban Ports: An Exploratory Comparative Analysis* (1998) by John Barton and John W. Selsky, and educationally-minded text books such as *Organization Theory Cases and Applications* by Richard L. Daft and Mark P. Sharfman (1990), *Management* (Daft, 1997), *Event Studies* (Getz, 2007) and *Festival & Special Event Management* (Allen *et al.*, 1999) are referenced, so as to give a well-rounded appreciation of OST's contributions to the social sciences.

Methodology of this study

The epistemological foundation of this thesis consists, in large part, of fourteen interviews carried out by the author. The interviews were conducted as a response to the previously indicated difficulties associated with source-based subjectivity and provide great insight into those challenges of film festival operation that are often kept out of the public sphere. As Christoph Huber (2009) notes “on paper, the potential for festivals is always greater – unencumbered by necessities or even simple scheduling conflicts the attractive stands out...and the eccentric is just charming” (p. 137). Thus, the information gained through these unique and often frank interviews present a rare opportunity to become better accustomed to reading the subtext of operation.

Organisations are traditionally difficult to study because they “exist primarily in the minds of people” (Milofsky, 1988, p. 5). Therefore, this study engaged in specialised research that could yield such information from both film festival organiser and resource providers.

These interviews are fundamentally similar to the type of research facilitated by Webber and by the authors from SECOR Consulting. In fact, Webber (2005) explains how her methodology did not originally include interviews. Only later was she to discover that interviews were necessary in order to provide the “first-hand detail” needed to further develop those concepts discovered through other sources (*A Local Context*, para. 23).

The Canadian-based SECOR Consulting group (2004) rationalises its use of interviews by explaining that,

[g]iven the complexity inherent to organizational analysis, we used a rigorous, strategic approach to produce a factual, pertinent picture of these events, positioning them in a broader international context. This approach required the use of various methodologies based on, among other things: in-depth interviews with Quebec, Canadian and foreign professionals meetings and telephone interviews with managers of the festivals in question. (p. 12)

SECOR Consulting conducted sixty interviews and administered questionnaires to film industry and audience stakeholder groups (Telefilm, 2009). The purpose of these interviews and questionnaires was to authenticate the findings of the report and justify its conclusions regarding what stakeholders require from participation. Such details needed to be addressed by this report as its outcome would ultimately determine the financial contributions of the Canadian Government towards its major film festivals.

The purpose of each interview conducted for the present work was to gain insight into how film festival organisers assess the film festival environment. This assessment includes the identification of those resource providers that are understood as vital to film festival operation, and discussion of the strategies used to improve and develop a continuous flow of resources into the film festival from these participants.

A breakdown of the interviews conducted by this thesis is as follows. A total of ten film festival organisers representing vastly different operational structures were questioned as to how they both perceived and responded to their physical environment and the requirements of their resource providers.

The interviews consisted of up to forty-four minute, in-person or telephone conversations. Prior to each interview, extensive research specific to each film festival and their resource providers was undertaken. The research examined information that was publicly available, e.g., dates of operation, mission statements, programming, previous interviews, sponsors, etc. The examination of this information ensured that each interview would yield new, previously unpublished information about the festival.

The methodology of the interviews is as follows. A week prior to the interview the interviewee was sent an e-mail outlining the topics of discussion. So, for example, the American-based *Denver International Film Festival* was sent the following four proposed topics for discussion:

1. The role of the Denver International Film Festival (DIFF) on both the international and local level.
2. How DIFF has changed over the course of twenty-seven years and ways in which it has grown or been stunted due to outside influences.
3. The relationship between DIFF and the Denver Film Society.
4. Ideas about DIFF's future and areas of contemporary cinema you would like to see better encompassed be they: educational, film industry facilitation, film market or as an outlet for specialty filmmakers.

These topics were used to prepare the interviewees for the interview, and to alert them to the type of information this thesis was seeking. Since festival organisers are extremely busy people, such a course of action also ensured that their valuable time was used as efficiently as possible, by allowing the interviewees to prepare notes on aspects of their film festival that may not have emerged in extemporaneous interviews. All interviewees were informed that their responses would form the basis of a PhD thesis and all were kind enough to grant their permission for the publication of those responses.

The information taken from these interviews has been utilised in structuring a pragmatic understanding of film festival operation within an open system environment. The term *pragmatic* is referenced in the sense of “achieving results or ‘getting things done’” (Encyclopædia Britannica, 2007). Thus, each interview is a testament to the particular ‘know-how’ of the individual film festival organiser and includes but is not limited to the strategies used to increase resource provider interaction, operational modifications designed to improve operational performance, and lessons learned from functional inadequacies.

This belief in the pragmatic applicability of a systems model, and OST in particular, to the collected data provides the ontological foundation of this thesis. Such an application forms the basis of Chapter Five in which four case studies are individually examined with respect to those particular open system conditions understood to influence film festival functionality. Transcripts of the interviews with all ten film festival organisers are located in the Appendices.

Four resource providers were also approached and kindly agreed to be interviewed. These interviews were conducted in order to gain a better perspective as to what various

groups intrinsic to film festival operation required and expected from their participation in a film festival. The interviewees were:

Michael Selwyn: Managing Director Paramount Pictures Australia, formally United International Pictures (UIP). A transcript of this interview forms Appendix One.

Cathy Robinson: Chief Executive of the Australian Film Commission (1989-1999); President of the Sydney Film Festival (2000-2005). A transcript of this interview forms Appendix Two.

Ruth Saunders: Australian Film, Television and Radio School (AFTRS) Marketing Manager and Film Festival Liaison. A transcript of this interview forms Appendix Three.

Tracy Mair: Principal of Tracy Mair Publicity, public relations consultant for the Australian Film Commission (1994-2004); public relations consultant for the Brisbane International Film Festival and Melbourne International Film Festival. A transcript of this interview forms Appendix Four.

Each interviewee's responses were instrumental in developing an understanding of the parameters of resource provider interaction. For example, both the Selwyn and Saunders interviews were particularly informative with regard to detailing the exhibition aspect of resource provider-film festival interaction. The Robinson interview provided insight as to a government funding perspective, while the Mair interview dealt with the media requirements and conditions of participation. When appropriate these individuals are cited throughout the thesis.

Practical case study experience

The author has an extensive background in film festival operation having been the director of four film festivals ranging in size and scope from an American-based intercollegiate two-day event, to an annual, nationally recognised secondary school film festival in Australia. During the final year of this study the author was the program manager for the Brisbane International Film Festival 2009.

During the course of the research for this thesis an opportunity presented itself for the author to assume the operational management of the Australian-based *Gold Coast Film Fantastic* for fourteen months (2008-2009). The operational management duties enabled the author to gain hands-on experience of the challenges of film festival operation given a

pre-existing condition of operational disorganisation. These operational duties included in the terms proposed and adopted by this research project: identification of entropy-driven, operational threats; the implementation of strategies designed to increase resource provider participation; the re-engaging of various local and international resource providers; interaction with new local and international resource providers; logistical planning, e.g., programming, guest co-ordination, print movement, etc.; and event operation.

A complete narrative of this experience in the form of a further, extended case study is undertaken in Chapter Five.

Chapter One

Introduction

Accomplished film festival director Darryl MacDonald (1998) comments that he is “always amazed” when he gets “a call from someone wanting to start a film festival who thinks that some kind of blueprint exists that will make everything simple” (p. 40). Those who attend a film festival see only a fraction of the organisational complexity of the event. The amount of co-ordination, negotiation, time and effort required to operate a functional film festival often catches organisers unprepared. Alan Franey (in Tanner, 2009), Director of the *Vancouver International Film Festival*, explains that unforeseen challenges of operation often make a candid discussion about film festival operation as “discouraging as it is encouraging” (p. 7).

These operational challenges have given rise to a growing number of film festival consultants who specialise in working with film festival organisers to overcome the difficulties of operation. Tanner (2009), for example, in her book *Creating Film Festivals: Everything You Wanted to Know But Didn't Know Who to Ask*, presents an impressive amount of information, but she does not provide a unifying critical assessment. On a much larger scale there exists the International Film Festival Summit (IFFS) whose self-proclaimed mission is to “promote and strengthen the global film festival industry through education, networking, dissemination of information and the cultivation of high standards for the industry” (IFFS, 2009, para. 2). Having been instituted in 2002, the IFFS offers what it terms a Certified Film Festival Professional Program. This *two-day* program optimistically aims to provide “an in-depth training curriculum covering the most important elements involved in film festival work” (BON, 2009, para. 1).

It can be hypothesised that these consultancies exist because of a perceived gap between what is practically known and what is academically understood. That is, those who have practical experience in film festival operation understand that the actual operation of the event generally resides along a continuum, stretching from chaos to stagnation, that has been under-theorised and that consequently requires interpretation by seasoned practitioners.

The chaotic⁶ nature of film festival operation results from the film festival environment being far from static, and is reflected in the continuously changing dynamics that influence how a given film festival is operated. McCarthy (1997) explains that the operation of the Cannes International Film Festival has historically been threatened by “enormous upheavals in the global film industry, changing tastes, political disruptions, artistic controversies and the challenges of countless other younger festivals around the world” (p. 11). Similarly, Webber (2005) reports that

the [Sydney Film F]estival had to reposition itself, philosophically and practically, to deal with the more challenging production environment created by the conflicting demands of audience, filmmakers, funding agencies and many other groups with investments in Australian film culture. (Chapter 3, para. 1)⁷

The dynamic nature of the film festival environment requires film festival operation to be an on-going process that involves frequent adjustments to environmental changes in order to attract and retain external participants. For example, Webber (2005) explains that if the Sydney Film Festival was “to survive long term it would need to move with the times” (Chapter 2, *Communal Rapture*, para. 1). Similarly, McCarthy (1997) comments that the environmental changes that “could have marked the end of Cannes instead provoked it to reform” (p. 15). Film festival operation has been variously described as film festival “evolution” (Beauchamp & Behar, 1992, p. 80; Elley, 1998, p. 169; Smith, 1999, p. 102), metamorphosis (Webber, 2005, *A Local Context*, para. 19; Porton, 2009, p. 2) and “adaptation” (Champlin in Bart, 1998, p. 62). The use of such terms hints at the volatility of the film festival environment.

The chaos created by the environment is the result of factors which include, but are not limited to, changes in cinematic trends; to business-related phenomenon, e.g., the Global Financial Crisis; to political unrest; biological epidemics; and to natural disasters. To combat this potential upheaval a film festival may partner with an external entity such

6 “[Chaos] in mechanics and mathematics, [is the] apparently random or unpredictable behaviour in systems governed by deterministic laws. A more accurate term, “deterministic chaos,” suggests a paradox because it connects two notions that are familiar and commonly regarded as incompatible. The first is that of randomness or unpredictability, as in the trajectory of a molecule in a gas or in the voting choice of a particular individual from out of a population. In conventional analyses, randomness was considered more apparent than real, arising from ignorance of the many causes at work. In other words, it was commonly believed that the world is unpredictable because it is complicated. The second notion is that of deterministic motion, as that of a pendulum or a planet, which has been accepted since the time of Isaac Newton as exemplifying the success of science in rendering predictable that which is initially complex.” chaos. (2009). Encyclopædia Britannica. Encyclopædia Britannica 2007 Ultimate Reference Suite. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.

7 As has been noted, this observation is of particular interest to the current work. More will be said of this in coming chapters.

as a business or government organisation in a sponsorship arrangement. The result of such a partnership may be a more stable environment in terms of unwavering support, but it also has the unwelcome potential to provide organisers with less freedom over their operational decisions.

Stagnation, for this thesis, represents the loss of artistic, creative or organisational control, and can occur when entities outside of the operational structure of the film festival itself become entrenched in operational aspects of the event. The dependency a film festival might have upon a major sponsor will undoubtedly influence how film festival organisers operate the event with regard to the needs and expectations of their benefactor. The consequences of not adhering to a particular set of expectations can lead to a withdrawal of support. In 1973 the Benson and Hedges Tobacco Company cancelled its sponsorship of a short film competition facilitated by the Sydney Film Festival because the content of one of the submissions “was found not to be consonant with the image the company wished to project” (Hope, 2004, p. 194).

Such outcomes, and the manner in which they are addressed by organisers, would be valuably served by a model which presented a basic framework of film festival operation. That is, those aspects that pose the greatest threat to operation could be formally represented and consequently identified in advance so as to avoid film festival organisers being caught unawares. This thesis proposes the adoption of such a model based on Open System Theory (OST). Yet before embarking on a discussion of the applications and ramifications of using OST as a conceptual framework for film festival operation, it is necessary to consider how this subject has been investigated previously. This chapter will therefore indicate how previous searches for an effective model have fared and will list those resultant models and their implications.

Film festivals as their own models

First and foremost, film festivals present their own frameworks for operation. There are numerous examples of film festival directors utilising the operational structures of other film festivals in an attempt to facilitate a similar type of event; a peer-modelling of sorts. The organisers of the American-based *Mill Valley Film Festival* relied upon the observations and experiences they encountered at the American-based *Telluride Film Festival* as the impetus for their own operation (Benson, 1998, p. 149). Similarly, Michael

Kutza, founder of the *Chicago International Film Festival*, decided after visiting Cannes in 1962 that he would create “a similar event” (Klady, 1998, p. 153).

Such isomorphic behaviour is a common trait among organisations that are fundamentally similar. According to Meyer and Rowan (1983), inherent structural similarities are the result of two possible factors: first, that organisations become “matched with their environments by technical and exchange interdependencies” (p. 28). That the majority of film festivals have the same basic needs for operation – a projector, a venue, a means of acquiring films – means they will be very similar in form.⁸

Second and alternatively, organisations are observed to “structurally reflect socially constructed reality” (p. 28). That is, the forms of film festivals are essentially dictated by their participants. To be more specific, the requirements distributors demand from organisers in order to interact with a film festival include press coverage for their films, an opportunity to conduct business, and access to new, potentially acquirable material, such as films without prior distribution. These requirements ultimately determine how film festival organisers structure their event. This factor of a ‘socially constructed reality’ influences the operational structure of film festivals as a whole because the presumed legitimacy of film festival operation becomes institutionalised. The results of this institutionalisation on organisations are outlined by Meyer and Rowan as being:

- the incorporation of “elements that are legitimated externally, rather than in terms of efficiency”;
- the utilisation of “external or ceremonial assessment criteria to define value of structural elements”; and
- the “dependence on externally fixed institutions which reduces turbulence and maintains stability” (p. 30).

Interestingly, institutionalised organisations that are recognised as being ‘important’ or ‘powerful’ have the ability to influence the elements that determine operational legitimacy (Meyer & Rowan, 1983). So, film festivals such as Cannes and Berlin, which are vital events for many film industry professionals, are able to control their conditions of interaction and the associated value of their events as they are judged externally. A similar perspective is adopted by Rüling (2009) who connects the dominance

⁸ The use of the term film reflects that of Noel Carroll (Carroll & Choi, 2006) who employs it to represent all forms of moving images, e.g., videotapes and computer imaging.

of the French-based *Annecy International Animated Film Festival and Market* to its role as a “field-configuring event” (p. 50). A ‘field-configuring event’, according to Rüling, sets the standard for the “emergence, reproduction and challenging of field-level identities, norms and standards” (p. 51). The outcome of institutionalisation can therefore be seen as the creation of what can be termed ‘ceremonial assessment criteria’ that best benefit only a certain type of film festival. In this case, film festival organisers must make conscious decisions as to what operational components are necessary for the actual operation of an event, and what components are strictly for ceremony, the implications of which will be discussed in a later chapter.

Because the present work is not an analysis of Organisational Theory, detailed examination of these two factors and how they are most appropriately applied to film festivals will not be entered into further. For the purpose of this study, both factors will be considered as having legitimate, formative control on the operational structure of the events. Unfortunately for peer modelling, as it has been observed to occur, simply copying another film festival’s structure does not ensure functional operation; similarity should not be seen to imply direct correspondence. Each film festival is a unique, individual organisation exposed to a host of distinctive variables that contribute to its operation, be that the physical environment in which an event is to occur, or the personalities and contacts of the organisers involved. It is therefore concluded that although individual film festivals present their own models of operation they are unique entities in themselves and should not be used to substantiate an effective model of operation that can be generally applied.

As well as film festivals themselves functioning as models of film festival operation, this study has encountered a number of sources that propose various methods of understanding the inner theoretical workings of film festival operation in order to facilitate successful processes. For the purpose of this study, these pre-existing methods are categorised into three groups which are differentiated according to the focus of the method. It is possible that additional groups exist, however the categorisation of these methods is done so as to provide a clear understanding of how differently others examining film festivals have interpreted aspects of film festival operation in another way. The three categories and a short description of their focus follows.

Instructional models

Instructional models offer no conceptual understanding of film festival operation other than that which is required for functionality, in this respect they may be viewed as ‘festival cookbooks’. The majority of these models generally focus on operational procedure. For example, the Internet-based articles *How to Start Your Own Film Festival* by Michelle Svenson (2001) and the eHow (2008) website’s *How to Organize a Film Festival* both explain film festival operation as merely a series of steps which includes the sourcing of funding, films and other resources identified by this thesis. While these sources provide an informed view of general film festival operation they ultimately contribute to what Katz and Kahn (1978) identify as “unexplainable” operational behaviour (p. 31) because both sources assume that the resources flowing into a film festival will be constant and consistent. For example, Svenson explains that festival organisers should start with “at least 5 to 10 types of [films]” (para. 10) but forgoes any additional explanation regarding the difficulties associated with the sourcing and securing of such a program. Similarly, eHow attempts to instruct film festival organisers on how to “solicit sponsorship” (para. 6), but fails to discuss the complexities that result from sponsorship support, e.g., the need for the film festival to adhere to the sponsor’s public image, and the ramifications a damaged relationship can have on film festival operation in later years.

Problems with instructional models

The assumed simplicity of participation is the result of presenting film festival operation as an isolated process. Both Svenson and the eHow article effectively remove any notion that a film festival is dependent upon its environment for operational resources. It is this severing of environmental ties that makes variations of film festival operation ‘unexplainable’, so, for example, film festival failure due to sponsorship withdrawal is not touched on by these works, because they do not accurately depict the operational conditions that influence and ultimately determine the functional viability of a film festival. In contrast, author Grady Hendrix (2005) provides a more accurate portrayal of the kinds of environmental-based considerations that must be made when examining film festival operation in his article *So You Want to Start a Film Festival...Don’t*. Hendrix explains that film festival operation is fraught with unpredictability ranging from film print availability to guaranteed audience attendance.

Thematic models

Thematic models offer more information in terms of the elements required to operate a film festival with a specific goal in mind. If, for example film festival organisers desire a business-orientated film festival then operational structures should include a market, distributor participation, etc. These models are often proposed by industry professionals and identify the aspects of film festival operation that are most commonly observed in the corporate sphere.

Research has uncovered six thematic models that are worthy of note in that they provide an explanation of the models' operation and do not simply apply a title and forego any description and analysis. These six models do not have specific names and are therefore identified by the type of model they represent and the originator's name.

International film festival model by Alfred Heintz (1963)

Alfred Heintz, a public relations practitioner, was commissioned by the Melbourne International Film Festival in 1963 to research the then existing models of film festival operation. At the conclusion of his research Heintz identified two types of international film festivals. As Hope (2004) says, the "most important aspect of Heintz's report is that he attempts to argue that there are two distinct types of international film festival: the 'commercial' and the 'artistic'" (p. 113). According to Heintz the *type* of film festival is based upon the functional *role* of the film festival. So, 'commercial' festivals are driven by the cinema industry and aimed at providing financial gain to their organisers and sponsors, while 'artistic' festivals have as their *raison d'être*, the provision of a cultural experience.

Heintz's differentiation between the two events is indicative of the expectations of the participants. That is, those attending the commercial film festival expected to receive financial benefits, be they direct, such as the buying or selling of a film, or indirect, such as the utilising of the film festival to promote a film for future commercial success. Heintz notes that the different functional aspects of the two types of festival influence who participates in the event and discerns participant crossover as very unlikely (p. 25).

International film festival model by the Melbourne International Film Festival (1964)

The organisers of the Melbourne International Film Festival were not satisfied by the outcome of Heintz's findings and commissioned another report to be carried out by their own public relations sub-committee. The objective of this report was to provide

information that was more “suitable” to the expectations and needs of the organisers (Hope, 2004, p. 113).

This report reaches the conclusion that there are essentially four types of film festival:

- trade festivals (such as Cannes and Venice), which are supported by producers with “high degrees of trade promotion, large foreign delegations, stars, tendency to sensationalism and tremendous expenditure on press activity”;
- tourist festivals, which function mainly as regional marketing devices;
- government festivals (such as in the communist states); and
- cultural festivals, staged by film societies with “little government or trade support” (Hope, 2004, p. 114).

According to Hope, this information was used by the festival organisers to nominate Melbourne as a ‘cultural festival’ and that in order to fulfil this role it would incorporate specialised programming. The rationale for this choice was that a cultural film festival enabled the organisers more opportunity in marketing the event in a fashion deemed to be “uncontaminated” by the film industry, as trade-based festivals were then believed to be (p. 113).

Urban film festival and resort community film festival models by Darryl Macdonald (1998)

Darryl Macdonald has had a long career in the development and operation of film festivals and is currently the executive director of the Palm Springs International Film Society. His involvement in a selection of other film festivals is as follows: as the co-founder and executive and artistic director of the *Seattle International Film Festival* (1975); as the programming director of the Vancouver International Film Festival (1988-1992); as artistic director of the *Palm Springs Film Festival* (1989-1993); and as the artistic director the *Hamptons Film Festival* (1993-1996); Macdonald (1998) explains in his “How to Launch a Community Film Fest” that

while there are many kinds of film festivals held currently in every corner of the country, two main models provide the prime examples for successful local film festivals: the urban film festival, such as those held annually in New York, Toronto and Seattle; and the resort community film festival, exemplified by those in Sundance, Telluride and Palm Springs. (p. 35)

Macdonald identifies the distinguishing characteristic between these two models as being their audience. He notes that the “big-city film festival relies on a large, somewhat sophisticated and diverse local populace to provide the audience”, while the audience of the resort community festival is most likely to include members from the “local filmgoing community as well as from cineastes and tourists” (p. 35).

While Macdonald does not present an operational model *per se*, he does discuss those “elements” (p. 36) which he deems are integral to each model. For example, the ‘urban model’ is “the least complicated” (p. 35) because its environment is likely to furnish the resources required for functionality. These resources range from “potential audiences, sponsors and staff to the theatres, hotels and other infrastructural requirements” (p. 36). Macdonald understands the ‘resort-style’ festivals as being inherently more challenging to operate because of a reliance upon the financial (including in-kind) support of local government and businesses. It is as a result of this reliance that Macdonald identifies “the one ingredient that all resort-style festivals must include to really provide a festival ambience for guests and filmgoers is some large and stellar parties” (p. 38), the rationale being that the event as a whole will appeal more to the non-film appreciating support base which is typical of resort-style communities.

In addition to these characteristics, Macdonald also provides information that is representative of operational advice. He presents a “List of Definite ‘do’s” (p. 43) that includes the following topics: the role and capabilities of a board of directors or trustees; the advantages of nonprofits status; and the importance of a “realistic budget” (p. 44) which includes subsections discussing various income streams and likely expenses. These ‘do’s’ are similar to the instructional models previously discussed. There is however, a major difference in terms of the realistic application of the advice. Macdonald’s experience-based insight provides a more meaningful assessment of the areas of film festival operation that are likely to be overlooked by film festival organisers and is consistent with Macdonald’s theme of providing a true understanding of what it means to operate a film festival. Unlike any of the other models proposed, Macdonald emphasises the need to understand the community in which the film festival will operate. He explains that the environment influences “the viability of starting up a film festival in your community and what you can expect in the way of potential audience sizes, sponsorship, availability and even the costs involved in mounting an event” (p. 40).

The disadvantage of Macdonald's urban and resort style models stems from the inconclusiveness of operational protocol presented. The information offered is valuable and the anecdotal references to his experiences in Palm Springs and the Hamptons Film Festival prove insightful, but forego any real modelling that can be used to better understand film festival operation.

Agenda-based model by Kenneth Turan (2003)

Kenneth Turan, an American film critic currently working for the *Los Angeles Times* and author of the book, *Sundance to Sarajevo: Film Festivals and the World They Made* categorises film festivals into three specific groups based upon the concept of 'agenda'. For Turan an 'agenda' refers to the underlying objective of the film festival organisers and their participants. Turan identifies three specific types of agendas:

- Business, under which rubric he includes Cannes, Sundance and ShoWest;
- Geopolitical, which includes the FESPACO; the Cuban-based *Havana International Film Festival*; the former Yugoslavian-based *Sarajevo International Film Festival*; and the Finish-based *Midnight Sun Film Festival*; and
- Aesthetic, in which he examines the Italian-based *Pordenone Days of Silent Cinema*, the American-based *Lone Pine Film Festival* and the American-based *Telluride International Film Festival*.

Though Turan does not provide specific details as to how each of these events operates, he does conduct a thorough case study of each film festival that provides conclusive examples of each category's specific characteristics.

Those festivals with a Business agenda are seen to have an influential film industry presence, be it the "biggest concentration of press in the country [occurring at Sundance]" (Nunes cited in Turan, 2003, p. 40); ShoWest's the "largest and most important gathering of motion picture professionals in the world" (p. 49); or the Marché International du Film (MIF) at Cannes that "attracts approximately 6,000 participants representing some 1,500 companies from more than seventy countries" (p. 23).

Alternatively, festivals with Geopolitical agendas are understood to have a cultural impact with undertones of nationalism, so FESPACO is labelled geopolitical and described as having a key role in the showcasing of African culture. Turan quotes the secretary general of the festival, Philippe Sawadogo as saying that "we understand that no people can

be developed without their own culture...If you know yourself in terms of identify, you can succeed” (p. 70). Both the Havana and Sarajevo Film Festivals are viewed similarly, each successfully operating even though confronted by larger more powerful political environments that worked against them.⁹

Aesthetic agendas are considered by Turan as most notable for their appreciation of highly specialised aspects of cinema which range from focusing on the medium itself, such as the silent films featured at Pordenone, to Lone Pine’s showcasing of the iconic landscape of the Alabama Hills which forms the backdrop of many American Westerns. Turan’s placement of film festivals into this latter category is predicated on a quality wholly unique to the individual event.

Organisational models of different festivals by SECOR Consulting (2004)

In 2004 the SECOR Consulting group made public a report commissioned by Telefilm Canada and SODEC (Société de Développement des Entreprises Culturelles) which investigated Canada's four major film festivals: Montréal's *World Film Festival*, the Toronto International Film Festival, the Vancouver International Film Festival and the *Atlantic Film Festival*.

This report (SECOR, 2004) makes no specific reference to models of film festival *operation* but does contain a table which breaks down six existing film festivals – Toronto, Montréal, Cannes, Berlin, the Netherland-based *International Film Festival Rotterdam*, and Sundance – so as to discern six components: Professional, Cinematheque/Collections, Distribution activities, Theatres, Other festivals, Educational activities. This table is titled “Organizational Models of Different Festivals” and its purpose is to provide an analysis of the various components which contribute to the organisational structure of the specified film festivals. Referred to as “activity diversification” these components are understood to “maximize” a film festival’s impact (p. 20). While the report does not clearly identify models of operation it can be reasoned that the identification of these components is indicative of a particular type of film festival; that being one which operates at a high professional level. Therefore, the authors of the report have inadvertently set a standard model of what a film festival that considers itself comparable to those listed on the table,

⁹ The Havana Film Festival faced operational challenges due to the United States sanctions against the country. The Sarajevo Film Festival continued operation through the Balkan conflict and become a symbol of the “spirit of Sarajevo” (p. 94). Turan, K. (2002) *Sundance to Sarajevo: Film Festivals and the World They Made*. California: University of California Press.

should consider co-opting if it is to gain similar status. It is important to note that of the listed festivals, only one, Toronto, fulfilled each of the components.

Two ideal festival models by Mark Peranson (2008/2009)

Mark Peranson works for the Vancouver International Film Festival and also edits for the *Cinema Scope* magazine. His paper “First You Get the Power, Then You Get the Money: Two Models of Film Festivals” was published in *Dekalog 3* and also appears in *Cineaste* (Peranson, 2008). This paper provides one of the most informative models of film festival operation encountered by this study since it not only considers those “characteristics typical to the operation of film festivals” but also the influence “interest groups” such as distributors, sponsors, etc., have on sustaining support (p. 38).

In a manner similar to Heintz, Peranson divides film festivals into two operational structures: Business and Audience. He explains that Cannes, Berlin, Venice, Toronto and Pusan are Business models, a distinction he makes based on the fact that these film festivals have major markets attached. Alternatively, he identifies Audience Festivals as ranging from Vancouver Film Festival, to the Seattle International Film Festival, as well as “San Francisco to Vienna to Buenos Aires” (p. 38).

What is perhaps most interesting about Peranson’s perceptions of film festival models is his observation that most events “fit somewhere in the middle” and that it is possible for film festivals to change models (p. 38). This implication of a spectrum of possible models presents a previously untapped approach to understanding film festival models and their operation. The rationale for Peranson’s model is based upon a comparison and contrast of the operational and physical qualities of the two types of festivals, so, for example, the comparison for staffing levels differentiates the two festivals according to “large” for business and “small” for audience (p. 38).

Problems with thematic models

The problems with these models are consistent with a general lack of specificity and the propensity for each of the authors to simplify operation. That is, they seem to wrap operation into a simple package without consideration for the logistics of each model. Such a packaging can be seen to contribute to the vague nature of film festival studies as a whole. While Heintz proposed a mere two models it is at least encouraging to see that the MIFF organisers were dissatisfied with such a simplistic system of categorisation. Simplistic too, is the work of Macdonald which, while it valuably raises the notion of community, leaves

out crucial information as to how to implement his two models. Turan's agenda-based model has its merits with regard to the types of social-based, i.e., agenda-driven, considerations worth examining. However the actual application is lacking in depth and practical example. In fact, Robert Koehler (2009) goes as far as to describe the Aesthetic model discussed by Turan as being a "extremely flawed and thinly conceived exploration" of what Koehler identifies as cinephilic festivals (p. 96). Thus, Turan's model presents only a limited view and further case studies are required to better encompass the variety of contemporary film festival functions.

Further exploration into the field by SECOR Consulting, with its notions of distinct components applicable to film festivals, provides a much needed emphasis on analysis and a resultant delineation of characteristics. That the analysis reflects only those festivals that can be deemed to be of major significance is a drawback of the study given the heterogeneous nature of the many festivals that attempt to eke out an existence. And it is disheartening to see a potentially valuable contribution such as Peranson's be satisfied with returning to a simplistic two-model system that glosses over the fact of festival heterogeneity.

Conceptual models

The objective of a conceptual framework can be seen as an attempt to understand the intention and motivation of the operational process. That is, to discern how the formation of a film festival enables the achievement of goals. Conceptual frameworks may be also be used to present how the film festival system as a whole works. Often, conceptual frameworks only provide guidance as opposed to direct instruction on how operation should be interpreted.

There exist other methods which may be used to interpret operation in a manner similar to this examination's application of OST to film festival operation. For example, it can be argued that aspects of Event Studies can be applied to film festival operation in order to gain a better understanding of the framework of its organisation. However the fact that Donald Getz (2007) utilises Open System Theory (p. 265) when discussing Organisational and Inter-organisational Behaviour, such as through the concept of "Open-system diagnostics and its role in facilitating an effective and efficient event" (p. 256), strengthens the conclusion reached by the current work that OST would ultimately be referenced should festival operation be viewed through the lense of Events Studies. The

application of Event Management frameworks such as those proposed in *Festival & Special Event Management* (2008) that see events categorised according to size and content have the potential too, to be generalised. Film festivals, as previously mentioned, are unique, and often they are ideologically different from other events such as concerts, art shows or sporting events, most of which have a dedicated and defined corps of external actors. Film festivals often do not have such a division as the events intersect two different, often conflicting view points: culture and business.

This culture/business divide characteristic of film festivals is commonly discussed by academics examining the film festival field (de Valck, 2007; Cheung, 2009; Hamid, 2009; Ran, 2009; Slocum, 2009; Peranson, 2009). This study too considers it an ideological partition that often determines the capacity in which individuals will participate. As Michael Selwyn (Selwyn, 2006) explains there exists both a “public side” and a “business side” to most film festivals and “unfortunately you have no link at all between the two”.

These conflicting viewpoints influence the organisational structure of the events and ultimately dictate how the event should be operated; proof of which can be found in the different thematic models that have just been examined. It is therefore ineffective to apply Event Studies models which, due to a lack of specificity, do not take into account the specialised and often conflicting nature of participation that occurs at most film festivals. This is however, not to discount the insight and information Event Studies can potentially provide film festival organisers with regard to the physical operation of a film festival, such as in the sourcing of volunteers, the developing a ticketing system, etc.

There is only one conceptual framework that stands out in terms of its presenting a highly developed application to film festivals. Marijke de Valck (2007) proposes the use of Network Theory and Actors Network Theory as a means of understanding why European film festivals were able to successfully adapt to changing environmental conditions both before and following World War II, while the European film avant-garde was not. These two models lie at the core of what she terms a “mobile line of inquiry” (p. 16), and are fitting methods to investigate the topic. The following will briefly establish the various subjects she discusses prior to assessing these theories as a potential model(s) for film festival operation.

De Valck's book, *Film Festivals* is described as "the first monograph to address a range of historical and methodological issues" and "the most comprehensive study on the subject to date" (Iordanova & Rhyne, 2009, p. 2). Such acclaim is well-warranted given that de Valck addresses subjects that range from the lack of academic connectivity existing in Cinema Studies (p. 33), to her argument that film festivals are "obligatory points of passage" (p. 36) in that they have an intrinsic network-based value that influences a range of external actors, such as distributors, filmmakers, media, etc. Her particular use of Network Theory is emblematic of her desire to examine film festivals without the need to reference or address the concept of hierarchy, and thus enables her to focus on the "various agendas that are pursued, acted out, and undermined by film festival events" (p. 30) without assigning a proscriptive value to those actors who participate. Bruno Latour's work is crucial in developing her concept of the circuits, networks and systems that surround and underlie film festivals, and enables her to recognise and distinguish the relationships between those "various entities that are present at film festivals such as film professionals, the cinemas, stars and cinephiles, as well as trade magazines and newspapers" (p. 30).

Through this understanding de Valck narrows her investigation and applies Actor-Network Theory (ANT). She notes that ANT has two main advantages when it comes to understanding film festivals as a whole. First, it "assumes *relational interdependence*" and therefore promotes the examination of the processes between actors and their networks as "*circulating entities*, [based] on movements and interactions between various entities that are produced within these relations" (p. 34 italics in original). Thus, de Valck is able to view film festivals as an overarching structure that incorporates all the interactions of its actors into its existence.

ANT also embraces both human and non-human actors as objects of study. As de Valck explains, the "rejection of human agency and the attention paid to non-human actors is highly relevant when studying the film festival network" (p. 34), and this is true, since, as she continues "it is not only the performances of the various festival visitors that matter. Non-human objects, such as press facilities and accreditation systems, are also objects worth of study" (p. 34). She is also correct in maintaining that an "examination of these actors can generate insights into the vital flows within the actor-network configurations" (p. 34).

Prior to an assessment of the feasibility of applying of Network Theory and Actor-Network Theory, either singly or in unison, as models of film festival operation, it is important to explain that de Valck examines all film festivals as if they were a single unified whole; she is particular in pointing out that she references the “film festival circuit”. The conflation of film festivals in such a manner is common, i.e., the viewing of the film festival circuit as an individual entity as opposed to a linear sequence of individual film festivals’ dates. The implication of viewing film festivals as a whole therefore influences the depth in which de Valck is able to comment on the operation of individual film festivals. Although she conducts several case studies that examine the individual operational processes of influential film festivals (Berlin, Cannes, Venice and Rotterdam), they are referenced against the environmental changes that influenced European film festivals across the board. For example, her first chapter discusses “Berlin and the Spatial Reconfiguration of Festivals from European Showcases to International Film Festival Circuit” (p. 45).

The application of Actor-Network Theory as a model of film festival operation has its overt merits. De Valck identifies the emphasis of ‘relational interdependence’ which has a significant role in any viable model of film festival operation. However, the theory itself is the product of participation, which can then be traced more foundationally to the concept of a social system. As previously mentioned, Parsons (1951) explains the “most significant” unit of interaction is participation (p. 25). It could therefore be argued that without the involvement of two or more actors the type of interdependence found in Networks Theory simply would not exist; the same can be said for Actor-Network Theory.

Both Network Theory and ANT represent an advanced level of theoretical understanding but do not provide adequate information appropriate to the first, or most basic, level of film festival operation. In fact, ANT itself represents a highly complex theory that is realistically beyond the theoretical interest of most film industry professionals. It is therefore more genuine to assume the work of Bruno Latour will reach a more receptive audience with purely academic interests than those film festival organisers who are interested in an intense theoretical understanding of film festival operation.

If under-theorisation is the bane of film festival organisers with regards to the applicability of the instructional and thematic models identified above, the converse is sometimes true for the proposals put forward and analysis conducted by those models

which are here identified as conceptual. Indeed it is over-theorising at the expense of pragmatic applicability that leads the current work to reluctantly set aside the otherwise informed and valuable work on festival structure achieved by de Valck. For surely it should not be necessary for festival practitioners to be cognisant of the intricacies of the (subsequently disavowed¹⁰) work of Bruno Latour in order to negotiate the day to day, minute to minute practicalities of organising an event.

Conclusion

The current models of film festival operation are valuable, but indicative of a field that does not have basic understanding of itself, nor of how film festivals work. The over-theorised conceptual work of de Valck, and the under-theorised and consequently overly simplistic thematic and instructional models make any attempt to formulate a comprehensive understanding of film festival operation difficult, disparate, and inconclusive. There are many more variations on film festival operation than the binary model that Heintz presents. This is something that Peranson hints at but does little to resolve. Festivals also come in sizes and stature much more varied than the work of SECOR examines. Macdonald contributes worthy categorisation of specific aspects of festival operation that should be attended to, but he fails to present a model that would frame their application; and Turan, while expanding the array of thematic study considerably does not examine the actual functioning of the events he so delineates.

The unification of these disparate and under-examined aspects of festival operation – the exploration of the specific needs of individual festivals and the requirement for a broad but sound theoretical basis for festival operation – is to be found in the application of Open System Theory. The next chapter will present such a model based upon Open System Theory.

¹⁰ "By the end of the [twentieth] century... Latour... advocated, abandoning what was wrong with ANT, that is 'actor', network', 'theory' without forgetting the hyphen." Crawford, C. S. (2007). Actor network theory. In G. Ritzer (ed.) Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology. USA: Sage, pp. 1-3.

Chapter Two

Introduction

It is the contention of this thesis that to date, no film festival-centred academic studies have presented a model of film festival operation that can be used for an in-depth examination of festival functionality or to predict a festival's operational longevity. Such a dearth of adequate modelling is confirmed by, and finds expression in, the literature as, for example, in *Film Festival Yearbook* (Iordanova & Rhyne, 2009) where a call is made for theorists to enter

into dialogue with one another and with festival practitioners in order to work through these kinds of terminological and methodological differences, if not toward consistency, then toward further interrogation of the theoretical models for film festival research. (p. 5)

The author of the current work is in the advantageous position of being both an academic and a current 'festival practitioner', having recently been responsible, in the role of festival director, for the operation of the Gold Coast Film Fantastic Festival, and is therefore uniquely placed to facilitate such dialogue.

Analysis of past and present modelling trends has been undertaken in the previous chapter and the conclusion reached that such attempts as have been made to redress the lack of practical advice for prospective festival organisers, and indeed for those currently organising festivals who wish to analyse their events, suffer from a number of failings. Those instructional and thematic models which attempt to provide practical guidance are overly simplistic in their approach to the complex structure of festival events, and under-theorised in the sense that they provide little data that is capable of systematic and rigorous academic assessment. Conversely those academic assessments that have been undertaken, while making valuable contributions to the growing field of film festival study, are overly theorised to a point where they become almost an exercise in pure theory and similarly leave under-examined the practical aspects of festival operation.

This chapter will seek to redress these imbalances by aligning film festival operation with a theoretically sound and established operational model. This model will facilitate the gathering of sound data, and is simultaneously simple enough to enable organisers to quickly and efficiently analyse that data in order to identify problems that may threaten operation. The ability to respond to perceived problems quickly is essential to

festival organisation which has been noted to be chaotic, involved and subject to rapid change.

The model proposed by this work is based on Open System Theory (OST). This chapter will commence with a brief history of OST by tracing its connectedness to the field of Systems Theory. At the same time it will provide evidence aligning film festival structure with an open system paradigm by displaying those discernible features of festival events that correspond to such a model. In so doing it will provide a sound theoretical foundation for the study of festival operation and will consequently indicate the practical applicability that such a model represents for festival organisers.

Systems theory

Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1972) explains that systems theory is widely applicable to the various sciences; to physics, biology, psychology and the social sciences. Von Bertalanffy explains a system as a “conceptual analog of certain rather universal traits of observed entities” (p. 416). He insists that using systems theory enables a “predictive value” when it comes to evaluating general structures (p. 416) and identifies three types of systems: real systems (those that are observed), conceptual systems (those linked to mathematics) and abstracted systems:

- real systems consist of “entities perceived in or inferred from observation and existing independently of an observer”;
- conceptual systems pertain to “logic or mathematics which essentially are symbolic constructs”;
- abstracted systems are a subclass of conceptual systems that “correspond” to reality, e.g., science (pp. 421-422).

These three classifications can be approximately aligned with the classification of current film festival operation detailed in Chapter One. That is, Bertalanffy’s ‘abstracted’ systems correspond to the instructional models of festival organisation which seek to apply perceived successful functionality to the construction of proposed events; ‘real’ systems are allied to thematic modelling in that the latter bases its authority on the observation of previously successful individual models and attempts to derive overarching principles of organisation; and ‘conceptual’ systems with conceptual models that represent highly-theorised (if non-pragmatic) assessments of operation. Certainly the parallels are not exact, but von Bertalanffy himself admits that the distinction between the elements of his ‘systems’ is “by no means as sharp as it would appear” (p. 422). The features of these

models correspond to a degree that encourages this author to proceed in the attempt to identify film festival models as systems, and warrants further investigation by other researchers into more precise correlations.

General system theory

In the 1930s von Bertalanffy (1972) began formulating the concept of general system theory (GST) through the notion that “models, principles and laws” exist that “apply to generalized systems or their subclasses irrespective of their particular kind, the nature of the component elements, and the relations or ‘forces’ between them” (p. 411). The universal nature of these ‘models, principles and laws’ provides the founding framework for a mathematical rubric under which all system-based sciences could be connected through the “exact formulations of terms such as wholeness and sum, differentiation, progressive mechanization, centralization, hierarchical order, finality and equifinality” (p. 411) that they are observed to share.

Kenneth Boulding (1956) provides a similar, albeit metaphorical, description explaining that GST is “the skeleton of science” because “it aims to provide a framework of structure of systems on which to hang the flesh and blood of particular disciplines and particular subject matters in an orderly and coherent corpus of knowledge” (p. 208). He further contributes to his explanation by noting that there are two possible approaches to the organisation of GST. The first approach involves the identification of common traits intrinsic to all disciplines which he terms “phenomena” (p. 201). He notes that one such ‘phenomenon’ is the “interaction of an ‘individual’ of some kind with its environment” and holds that every “discipline studies some kind of ‘individual’ – electron, atom, molecule, crystal, virus, cell, plant, animal, man, family, tribe, state, church, firm, corporation, university, and so on” (p. 201).

The second approach is conducted through the “arrangement of theoretical systems and constructs into a hierarchy of complexity, roughly corresponding to the complexity of the ‘individuals’ of the various empirical fields” (p. 202). This ‘hierarchy’ leads to a “system of systems” through which he proposes the arrangement of the following possible “levels of theoretical discourse” (p. 202). Composed of nine “Levels”, these discourses range from the application of a “static structure” that functions as a framework for efficiently mapping subjects (p. 202), e.g., the anatomy of the gene, to Transcendental

systems, a concept based upon the realisation that, in life and the universe, there are and always will be “ultimates and absolutes and the inescapable unknowables” (p. 205).

Though all levels contribute to a unique understanding of GST, two levels are of particular interest to this study: Levels Four and Eight – Open System and Social Organisations, respectively. Prior to the discussion of these two individual levels it is important to note that Boulding attributes the “most valuable” (p. 201) aspect of this approach to its level-based interconnectivity of the various systems. That is, as the levels ascend they automatically incorporate the traits of levels below. Such a concept has beneficial applications in that it enables researchers to examine a subject beyond that which is observed to exist and ‘dig’ deep into its inner workings.

The Open System is described by Boulding (1956) as the level at which life begins and “the existence of even the simplest living organism is inconceivable without ingestion, excretion and metabolic exchange” (p. 203). This definition is congruent with von Bertalanffy’s (1972) own understanding of an Open System. As a biologist, the latter sought to understand the how his proposed systems exchanged material with the environment “as every ‘living’ system does” (p. 412). It is this system-environment interaction with the ultimate intention of exchange that Katz and Kahn (1978) use as their framework to “overcome the shortcomings of psychological theorizing” and understand “the system character of social relationships and their transactions of systems with their environments” (p. 15). This is an exact analogue of Boulding’s Eighth Level, social organisations. The hierarchy of levels places social organisations just above that of the human level, thus those traits that are indicative of humans are inherent to this level.¹¹ According to Boulding:

The unit of such [social] systems is not perhaps a person – the individual human as such – but the ‘role’[;] that part of a person which is concerned with the organization or situation in question, and it is tempting to define social organizations, or almost any social system, as a set of roles tied together with channels of communication. (p. 205)

¹¹ Boulding notes that the division between the human and social organizations level is not “easy to separate clearly” (p. 205) due to the interconnectivity of the two subjects.

Social systems

Social systems are understood to be “contrived” and “imperfect” because the foundations for interaction are “anchored in the attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, motivations, habits, and expectations of human beings” (Katz and Kahn, 1978, p. 37) rather than in physical necessity. It is for this reason that the resources needed from the environment (inputs) cannot be assumed, because, while stakeholder participation may be predicted, it cannot be made certain. Thus, systems theory can be seen to bear a striking resemblance to the processes of festival organisation that Hendrix (2005) has likened to “a delicate psychological game” (para. 6) in which film festival organisers present the best possible scenarios for the most highly sought resources.

As previously mentioned, it is the interaction between two or more actors that enables social systems to be studied (Parsons, 1951). If there is only one actor, i.e., the system itself, then the concept of a social system cannot be applied as the system represents a closed system. Richard Daft (1997) defines a closed system as a “system that does not interact with the external environment” (p. 55); nor does it need to, as no materials either enter or exit the system.¹² Parsons refers to actors as encompassing two groups: “ego” in which an actor or a group of actors are “treated as a unit for purpose of the analysis of orientation” (p. 4) and “alter”, those actors who are understood to interact with ‘ego’. It is interesting to note that Parsons identifies physical objects as “empirical entities which do not ‘interact’ with or “respond” to ‘ego’. They are a means and condition of [their] action” (p. 4). This understanding conflicts with Actor Network Theory which does not view the hierarchical connection of the creator and the created.

The action that occurs between both sets of actors is the result of ‘ego’ appealing to the “attitudes, perceptions, beliefs, motivations, habits, and expectations” of ‘alter’. It is these human characteristics that make a social system social, as opposed to biological or chemical. Simply put, without the agreed participation or ‘alter’, which is based upon the motivation for interaction, i.e., the perceived possible benefits of interaction, ‘ego’ could not function because it cannot furnish the resources itself. Thus, this dependency upon the external environment aligns social systems in the same order as open systems. However, it must be noted that importation alone does not qualify an organisation to be either a social or open system. Katz and Kahn (1978) stipulate that if a social system is to be considered a

¹² Von Bertalanffy (1972) does point out that according to the second law of thermodynamics, the inevitable increase of entropy over time, that “closed systems must eventually reach a state of equilibrium” (p. 156).

social system there must be “patterned activity” (p. 20). From this ‘patterned activity’ examiners must be able to identify both the importation of materials as well as the exportation of an outcome, be it physical, such as steel entering a factory and exiting as a finished car, or an intangible, such as an experience gained from a seminar. If patterned activity does not exist, i.e., activity is infrequent or occurs only once, then the subject in question is not a social system-based organisation (p. 20).

This patterned activity provides two characteristics indicative of social systems. First, the patterned activity must yield a result, so imported material cannot stay within the organisation but must be exported. Second, that material which is exported from an organisation must be seen to “reactivate the pattern” (p. 21). This ‘reactivation’ further stimulates importation thus promoting a continuous cycle. The continuous cycles as well as the concept of importation, transformation, and export are consistent with the previously mentioned “common characteristics” of open systems (Katz & Kahn, 1978, pp. 23-30). Therefore it can be contented that if a social system shares these characteristics it should also be considered an open system.

Open systems

Open System Theory (OST) is perhaps best known as the structural centrepiece of Katz and Kahn’s (1978) seminal work *The Social Psychology of Organizations*. The authors use OST to better their understanding of social systems and are understood to be among the leaders of the theoretical application of the concept to social-based organisations. It is from their application of OST to social systems, with reference to environmental and social system connections, that this thesis formulates its own understanding of film festival operation. While von Bertalanffy’s work is important as a tool of categorisation, he only proposes the theory’s potential use. Because Katz and Kahn’s interpretation and analysis discuss the practical application of their theories to social system organisations, it is to the latter authors to whom the current work will pay closer attention and upon whose work it will most heavily rely.

Katz and Kahn explain that “through the application of Open System Theory, we are beginning to move towards a social psychology concerned with social structures” (p. 2) and hold that this approach

emphasize[s] the aspect of social behaviour patterns: (1) their system character, so that movement in one part leads in predictable fashion to movement in another

part and (2) their openness to environmental inputs, so that they are continually in a state of flux. (p. 3)

They admit that their interpretation of OST “is not yet fully developed” but hold that “important contributions to its growth can be found in... the general systems theory of von Bertalanffy and... the sociological theory of Talcott Parsons” (p. 15). Those features of OST that have been previously discussed, i.e., the cyclical-pattern in which material is imported from the external environment, transformed and exported back into environment, represent only one aspect of the characteristics that constitute OST. Other aspects of the theory are best explained through practical examples and will be discussed in greater detail below during a rationalising of film festivals as open systems. However, before pressing on with the identification of film festivals as open systems it is important to stress the overwhelming degree of dependency open systems have on their environment for resources. Unlike closed systems, which have the ability to furnish their operational needs and are therefore self-sustainable, open systems do not have the infrastructure or ability to manufacture the type or amount of resources required for their functional operation. This makes open system organisations completely dependent upon the participation of external groups and individuals – participants – in order to operate. Without the interaction and successful acquisition of an adequate amount of resources from external sources, an open system organisation would fail to function.

Film festivals as systems

Film festivals can be identified as systems because their operation exemplifies that interrelation of elements, both internal and external, that are indicative of the term’s definition. However, definitions by their very nature as summary statements of facts and attributes are limiting in the understanding they promote, in the sense that they provide only a general view when compared to a systematic examination of the various aspects of a specific subject. It is with this in mind that the following will discuss the systematic aspects of film festival operation with regard to the screening of a film.

The inclusion of a film into a film festival’s program involves a series of interrelated events and elements.¹³ Films are commonly selected for programming after having been viewed at another film festival or via ‘screeners’ issued by distribution

¹³ For ease of discussion the actual entry of the film into the festival will be viewed as the first stage of inclusion though it could be contested that the process begins with the idea for a film and subsequent pre-production, production, etc., which inevitably lead to the completed film being entered into the festival.

companies. Alternatively films are selected ‘sight-unseen’ in which case the attention, e.g., media stories, concerning a particular title, or the reputation of an individual involved with the film’s production, motivate the festival organisers to actively pursue it for programming. These films are often invited into a film festival by official invitation, the communicated acceptance of a title into a festival which is written by a festival staff member and mailed electronically or traditionally to the film’s source. Films are also programmed by unsolicited entry. In this case the title is entered into a film festival via a designated channel, by, for example, a call for entries, in which case if the title is selected – which often requires the formation of a selection panel – an official invitation is generally issued.

From this point correspondence between the film festival organiser and the filmmakers, rights holders, distributors, etc., commences. Screening fees are negotiated, dates of shipment set, publicity stills requested, and various other activities undertaken such as the title’s placement within the programming, attention to technical requirements with regard to the venues, and issues of censorship, and all occur virtually simultaneously.

The exhibition of the film involves the cueing of tapes or print preparation, formatting of aspect ratios, test screenings to assure screening quality, in addition to the selling of tickets and the entry of an audience into a venue to view the film. The screening may also be accompanied by a short introductory speech, in which case the presenter will be required to compose a brief of information to present, which may include but is not limited to, outlining the film’s production, acknowledging the key individuals involved in that production, as well as providing tips on how to ‘read’ the film, etc.

Once the screening is over the film must be returned, and this requires the breaking down of the print/repackaging of the tape, correspondence with the title’s source regarding its next destination, shipping logistics, and finally delivery by courier or other means of transportation.

There are, of course, a plethora of other elements involved and actions to be undertaken, particularly should some unforeseen event disrupt the flow of the process. Yet this simplistic rendering serves to indicate the number and intricacies of systemic actions and reactions that unfold during this single process of operation. Similar examples could be constructed concerning funding or the procuring and hosting of film festival guests, to name just two, that would further display how film festivals exemplify the characteristics

of a system in terms of the previous discussion. What also becomes apparent is the efficacy of a systematic approach to understanding film festival operation in ‘breaking down’ the process of the screening of a film into individual actions which ultimately contribute to the festival’s functionality as a whole. This is point worthy of further investigation and will be pursued in greater detail in Chapter Three.

Film festivals as social systems

The social connectivity of film festival operation is obvious. As Iordanova (2009) notes “[f]estivals need films” (p. 25) and the acquisition of films requires interaction with the external environment in the form of relationships with film sources, e.g., distributors, filmmakers, etc., so as to ensure their importation. According to Parsons (1951), such interaction is driven by the “optimization of gratification” (p. 5) of both the ‘ego’ and ‘alter’.

Optimisation of gratification

This ‘optimisation of gratification’ works fundamentally because as Iordanova (2009) also notes “[f]ilms need festivals” (p. 24) thus the interaction between film festivals and film suppliers appears mutually beneficial. The term *appears* is used advisedly, because as this study will make abundantly clear in later discussion, the relationships between film festivals and their external participants are rarely simple affairs. Indeed, they form a topic imbued with such complexity as to be worthy of a separate study of their own. However, it is enough here to declare that the social connectivity between a film festival and its participants – those individuals and groups in the external environment – is based upon motivated participation with the intention of a beneficial outcome.

It is due to this motivational participation that film festivals can be identified as social systems. Unlike biological, chemical or other physical systems, the elements required for operation are available for importation only after interaction has been *agreed* upon. This is a process which involves the rationalisation of participation by a range of participants according to their particular attitudes, beliefs and perceptions of both the film festival (in the form of its organiser) and the members of its external environment.

Those individuals and groups that participate in film festivals and ultimately contribute to their operation are frequently topics of discussion. Peranson (2008) lists seven “Interest Groups” (p. 39) that attend film festivals and the reasons he discerns for their participation. These groups are differentiated according to the various needs they

have for a film festival. So, for example, a sales agent utilises a “business festival” to promote and sell films, but would use an “audience festival” primarily as a means of generating money from hire fees (p. 39).

A similar means of categorisation is presented in SECOR Consulting’s (2004) analysis of Canadian film festivals. The report identifies “three main types of stakeholders: general public, film professionals and public partners” (p. 3). The rationale for this categorisation is to draw attention to the various expectations of the participants and to set a national standard in terms of the quality of the performance.

The phenomenal influx of people who attend film festivals has also been the subject of attention. Turan (2003) notes that the attendance at Sundance has increased by almost 900 percent between 1985 and 1999 to 135,922 seats (p. 32). Beauchamp and Behar (1992) describe the inflow of people into Cannes as

thirty thousand people from throughout the world [who] converge for that fortnight to see and be seen, buy and be bought, sell and be sold, review and be reviewed, promote and be promoted, and/or somehow be part of the movies. (p. 21)

Such examples indicate the inherent social activity that occurs with film festival operation and the important role external participation has in film festival functionality. However, social activity alone does not fulfil all the characteristics deemed necessary for a system to be regarded as a social system. As previously mentioned, Katz and Kahn (1978) explain the necessary existence of “patterned activity” (p. 20) and an output-based “reactivation” of the environment, as two means of confidently identifying a social system. Both of these characteristics will now be discussed in relation to film festivals.

Patterned activity and reactivation

Film festivals can be seen to display ‘patterned activity’ in a number of operational processes which include, but are not limited to, aspects of programming, funding acquisition, volunteer involvement and marketing. One of the most obvious markers of film festival activity is the yearly call for entries; this open declaration invites those with films eligible for programming to submit their work to the festival. The annual attendance of film programmers at Berlin, Venice, Toronto, Cannes or any other kind of canvassing for films can also be discerned as a pattern of festival activity.

In the case of an already extant film festival it is difficult to identify an exact point at which film festival activity actually commences and concludes. Often film festival organisers begin planning and making arrangements for future events, e.g., the issuing of invitations for special guests, so far in advance that such activity occurs simultaneously with another period of activity in the current festival. That is, arrangements for a film festival to be held in 2011 are more than likely to begin early in 2010.

Such an operational structure represents an identifiable cycle (or cycles) of activity. The actual aspects of such a cycle are unique to each individual film festival at particular moments of operation and are highly dependent upon a number of variables including: employment contracts, funding opportunities and alignment with the festival circuit. In an effort to discuss aspects of film festival operation SECOR Consulting (2004) identifies eight major phases of film festival operation: “planning, sourcing, selection, organisation, programming, marketing, delivery and assessment” (p. 29). According to the report, these main activities occur in “a circular process, since the end of each festival marks the start of organizing the next one, with the results of the year ended providing key input for the following year’s planning” (p. 29).

Such information is useful as a general outline of film festival operation, and demonstrates the ‘patterned activity’ Katz and Kahn (1978) require of social system organisation. The ‘reactivation’ of this pattern however, requires a more considered view of film festival operation. Through the cycle of operation film festivals aim to perpetuate their value to the external participants they rely upon for resources. Distribution deals that occur at film festivals, such as the ‘buying frenzy’ which took place at Sundance in 1996, when more films were sold in six days than in the whole of the previous year and a half, have, the ability to re-energise the potential gratification external participants use as motivation for participation. According to Geoffrey Gilmore, Sundance Festival Director (1990-2009), the 1996 event “inspired the kind of buzz and interest where the industry and filmmaking community says, ‘That is great, this is a door, something I can walk through’ ” (in Biskind, 2004, p. 228).

Similar, but less publicised, reactivation also occurs with regard to funding. In the majority of instances in which film festivals receive funding from a Government funding body, the festival is required to submit an acquittal form demonstrating how the funding was spent and ultimately contributed to the event. If an acquittal is successful, the festival

then has a greater likelihood of future funding. Should the acquittal not be submitted or be judged to be unsatisfactory the organisation is no longer eligible for future funding. This example serves the purpose of fulfilling all three identified requirements of social system identification in that it simultaneously represents ‘optimisation gratification’, ‘patterned activity’ and ‘reactivation’. It would thus seem undeniable that film festivals can be identified as social systems.

Film festivals are open systems

The discussion above has identified the systematic, social system-based operation of film festivals. Having logically deduced that film festivals are indeed social systems it need hardly be asserted that they are also open systems. However, in order to firmly entrench that notion a final discussion will be undertaken to establish this fact. First, by displaying that they are not closed systems and second, by applying a further set of criteria supplied by Katz and Kahn (1978) that examines the degree of environmental dependency of a system in order to deem it an open system.

Film festivals are not closed systems

A closed system is characterised by a “time-independent state of equilibrium where the composition remains constant” (von Bertalanffy, 1950, p. 156). This ‘time-independent state of equilibrium’ enables closed systems to operate completely isolated from their environment. Though many film festivals are able to manufacture some of their own resources, e.g., publicity and even, on occasions, films, such production does not match the scale or range of resources required to truly become self-sufficient. This is not to say that some film festivals are not closely aligned to closed systems, but the ultimate understanding of film festival operation recognises the environmental dependency of these events. It is this innate dependency upon the external environment to provide resources for operation that causes film festivals to be open systems. Simply put, if a film festival was able to produce its own films, manufacture its own technology and supply its own audience it would, in effect, have zero dependency on its environment. However, such conditions are contrary the way film festivals function, and so, by default film festivals are open systems.

Levels of environmental dependency

The level of environmental dependency of film festivals is a variable of the operational structure of each individual event. That is, vastly complex film festivals such

as Cannes and Venice will necessarily have more diverse and varying levels of dependency with a greater range of external participants than a local film festival which screens films from its immediate physical environment. To further this study's examination of film festivals as open systems, those characteristics alluded to earlier, ten in number, which Katz and Kahn (1978) hold to "define all open systems" will be scrutinised with regard to these events.

1. Importation of energy

Energy in this case is synonymous with resources, e.g., films, guests, funding, media attention, etc. Thus film festival organisers must actively procure the importation of resources from the environment in order to function. The type and amount of each resource is unique to each film festival and though generally consistent it is difficult to assign a standard level required as the volume of resources fluctuates. Therefore the critical mass of resources required for operation is dependent upon what is necessary in order to facilitate operation at that particular time. The importation of resources occurs regularly as there is a constant need to replace those resources that have been transformed through operation.

2. The throughput of energy

Resources imported into a film festival are transformed through operation. Examples of this transformation are observable in the programming or arranging of films into individual sections or screening order. Such positioning influences the thematic presence of a film and can influence how a film is perceived and/or received by an audience. Similarly, funding is often transformed to purchase equipment or services needed for operation.

3. The output

Transformed resources are released back into the external environment. Examples of output include, the physical screening of a film, the experience of an audience member, the ownership of a piece of equipment.

4. Systems as cycles of events

As previously discussed, Katz and Kahn (1978) identify patterned activity as a characteristic of a social system (p. 20). The same can be said of an open system as the importation, transformation and exportation of energy re-energises the external environment and promotes further importation and subsequent activities. Film festivals are

known to operate according to a cycle of operation. The boundaries of the cycle are difficult to identify but key indicators of cyclical activity include the importation of films, funding, attendance of guests, as well as heightened levels of activity, i.e., screenings, community presence and marketing campaigns.

5. Negative entropy

Entropy is defined as “disorder”, and is a “universal property of systems and refers to their tendency to run down and die” (Daft, 1997, p. 55). An organisation is continually moving towards disorganisation (operational failure) while it is in operation as the imported resources are transformed and released into the environment. To address this constant move towards disorganisation is to promote *negative* entropy, which refurbishes the resources that are spent during transformation and enables the system to continue operating. Film festivals must continually promote negative entropy since films, funding and festival guests are subject to certain restrictions, e.g., time frames, which make their involvement in film festivals conditional.

6. Information input, negative feedback and the coding process

Katz and Kahn (1978) explain that systems require a method that enables organisers to ratify or amend problematic aspects of operation: “If there is no corrective device to get a system back on its course, it will expend too much energy or it will ingest too much energetic input and no longer continue as a system” (p. 26). Such ‘corrective devices’ are apparent in film festival operation and include: box office, attendance, exit surveys (both physical and electronic), acquittal assessments and festival reports (for Government or Board of Trustees review).

7. The steady state and dynamic homeostasis

A steady state occurs when there is a continuous flow of inputs into an organisation which then counteracts the entropy caused by the output of resources back into the environment; this is not equilibrium (p. 26). Though not readily observable, the steady states of film festivals are often reflected in the budget reports which draw parallels and ratios regarding the income of the festival to that of the expenses of facilitating the event.

8. *Differentiation*

Differentiation is a process that sees social organisations move “towards the multiplication and elaboration of roles with greater specialization of function” (p. 29). Since the first film festival appeared in 1932 the total number of events has increased and become more diverse and specialised. This diversification can be viewed in the operation of niche film festivals that specialise in topic, genre and format, e.g., gay and lesbian film festivals, silent film festivals, horror film festivals, etc. Marijke de Valck (2007) discusses this open system characteristic referring to it as “specialization” (p. 179). She observes that differentiation occurred most rapidly “from the 1980s onwards, when the global proliferation and professionalization of the festival phenomenon coincided and specializations were increasingly of non-political nature, such as genre, children’s film and documentary” (p. 179).

9. *Integration and co-ordination*

This characteristic is unique to social systems. Integration is defined as “the achievement of unification through shared norms and values” (p. 30). Full integration has not occurred on a formalised level due to the widespread location and varied nature of film festivals, though sanctioning organisations such as FIAPF are indicative of an attempt to establish ‘shared norms and values’. Co-ordination represents a fixed control and is observable in the existence of the festival circuit. Interestingly, Katz and Kahn (1978) note that “[f]or large social organizations, coordination, rather than integration, is the rule for providing orderly and systematic articulation” (p. 30). This may be the reason why inclusion in the festival circuit has such an important role and seems to be more highly contested than inclusion into sanctioning organisations.

10. *Equifinality*

Katz and Kahn describe equifinality as the ability of a system to reach “the same final state from differing internal conditions and by a variety of paths” (p. 30). This is readily observable in film festivals as the individual nature of each event ensures that each festival begins operation with a different set of conditions and variables yet proceeds to the same end of exhibiting films.

Open system applications to other social systems

Using Open System Theory in this fashion is not without precedent. A number of authors utilise OST's concepts as a means of gaining practical insight. For example, Barton and Selsky (1998) in their *An Open-Systems Perspective on Urban Ports: An Exploratory Comparative Analysis* explain how Open System Theory enables them to analyse a New Zealand-based port. The use of Open System Theory in this manner demonstrates its practical and versatile application to social systems, so enabling investigators to overcome previously "limited" ways of thinking about organisations (Daft & Sharfman, 1990, p. xii) and formulate a more realistic view of the factors that influence operation.

There are also examples of how the concepts of Open System Theory can be applied directly to organisations. Laura Leigh Roelofs (2008) uses Open System Theory in order to "help understand the challenges (and opportunities) symphony orchestra organisations face" (para. 13). In so doing, she aims to help orchestras achieve greater efficiency within their environments by positing that an orchestra is an open system because it

takes in resources and information and processes them in a variety of ways, returning a range of cultural services and products to individuals and systems in its environment. It is highly dependent on that environment for sustenance and survival. (para. 3)

Similarly, Becky J. Starnes (2000) utilises Open System Theory in her analysis of how non-profit organisations are able to gain a competitive advantage through the implementation of "strategic alliances" (p. 16). Starnes explains that in order for managers to think strategically they must "see the organisation as a system that functions by acquiring inputs from the environment, transforming them in some way, and discharging outputs back into the environment" (p. 16).

Conclusion

The above discussion has followed the theoretical development of systems theory and identified the evidence from the theory's own proponents to align it, along with biological, chemical and other physical systems, as a type of open system. Note was made of the various requirements that a system must fulfil in order for it to be considered an open system and the correspondence of these requirements to the varied aspects and elements involved in the operation film festivals was undertaken. These ranged from the

identification of festivals as systems through the work of von Bertalanffy where previous models were seen to be analogous to the types of systems he proposed in his pioneering work of systems theory. That is, ‘real’ systems, ‘abstracted’ systems and ‘conceptual’ systems were seen to correspond, respectively, to the instructional, thematic and conceptual models that were proposed as describing the current field of film festival operation studies.

Boulding’s expanded ‘system of systems’ was employed to show the cumulative aspects inherent to various types of system and indicate that social systems do indeed bear the characteristics of an open system in that they require for their very existence a system-environment interaction. This view was made explicit through the work of Parsons which shows that, in order for a system to be regarded as open the interaction of at least two actors is necessary to ensure that a system does not become, or cannot be regarded as closed. Most importantly the work of Katz and Kahn was presented to reinforce social systems’ identification as open systems.

This was followed by an examination of those aspects of film festival operation that indicate the justifications for regarding it as first, a system and then, a social system according to the previous theoretical considerations. First by showing that film festival operation is dependent on the participation of external resource providers subject to the motivational impetus of the perceived benefits that their interaction may accrue. Note was then made of the concepts of ‘pattern activity’ and ‘reactivation’ and parallels drawn with film festivals’ cyclical mode of operation and their aim to perpetuate their own existence. The logical conclusion was reached that film festivals are themselves open systems. Confirmation of this conclusion was achieved by first displaying that because of their reliance on their environment film festivals cannot be regarded as closed systems and then by referencing the ten characteristics that Katz and Kahn posit as defining attributes of open systems and indicating that they conform to each prerequisite. Reference has been made to the fact that previous analyses of social systems have been undertaken by employing OST.

The value and implications of an open system paradigm

Having achieved the identification of film festivals as open systems, a discussion of an open system paradigm application to film festival operation may be undertaken and will be the task of the Chapter Three. The application of an open system model to the various

aspects of festival operation results in a variety of advantages over those alternative models discussed in the Chapter One. It will be seen that even though OST is a robust *theoretical* model it allows for the ready generation of valuable *practical* data, and that its processes are readily observable and that it is easy for the practitioner to apply.

OST makes film festival operation effectively explainable at a practical level. Because of the efficacy with which it allows for the specific examination of individual operational aspects, the basic characteristics of OST enable a framework of operational parameters to be set. Film festivals, by their nature, require socially-based participation. This participation is viewed as not merely the product of their functionality but as a critical requirement of actual operation. Because OST too, is chiefly based upon the concept of a necessary importation from an external source into the system, the majority of this examination will focus on importation. By viewing film festivals through the lense of an open system model the functional longevity of festival operation can become predictable and even be strategically engineered.

Chapter Three

Introduction

In the last chapter film festivals were proven to be systems due to their interconnectivity. This interconnectivity was demonstrated both in their physical acquisition of resources, e.g., the process involved in programming films, and in the need for film festival organisers to address the social requirements of participants, i.e., perceptions, experiences, etc., in order to achieve patterned activity and reactivation. This focus of this systematic operation was narrowed so as to indicate film festival operation as a social system; a system that is based upon motivated participation as opposed to a physical or chemical reaction. The systematic understanding was further refined to the point where the understanding that film festivals are not closed systems but rather are dependent upon actors in their environment for the resources required for operation, and are therefore open systems, was made apparent.

In this chapter a model of film festival operation based upon an open system paradigm will be presented. Following the presentation of this model the practical nature of its application will be scrutinised concurrently in the following areas. These areas represent the same areas in which the previous models were criticised:

- ease of applicability;
- observability; and
- rationale.

The application of an open system model to film festival operation is not without its disadvantages and these will also be discussed.

Open system theory as a model of film festival operation

Open System Theory (OST) is, itself, a conceptual model of operation. That is, the characteristics presented by Katz and Kahn (1978) provide a structural framework that enables researchers to formulate an understanding of the basic organisational operations of a system. The strength of OST lies in its generalisability; it is capable of being applied to a range of studies and disciplines. Yet, Katz and Kahn (1978) acknowledge that although all open systems share “common characteristics by virtue of being open”, they may have “other characteristics” indicative of their individual operation (p. 23). For example, an automotive factory is obviously an open system: components are necessarily imported into the factory where they are transformed by the labour force and output as cars. Yet, a film festival, though also an open system is, by the nature of its operation, fundamentally

different from an automotive factory. Film festivals are first and foremost sites of exhibition; rarely will a film festival enter into the physical process of film production in the same way in which an automotive factory manufactures cars. Even in unique cases – such as a 24-hour film festival where filmmakers attempt to shoot and edit a film within a set period of time – festival organisers still occupy the role of the exhibitor, because it is around the *screening* of these films that the entire event is scheduled and ultimately based.

A consequence of this exhibitor's role is that film festival operation differs from other open systems in being of noticeably shorter duration. The actual physical processes of operation – multiple screenings, hosting of festival guests, bestowing of awards – generally occur only once, and at a nominated time. This distinctive operational structure sets film festivals apart from many other types of open system social organisations, which can be observed to have a year-round as well as year-to-year existence. Webber (2005) explains this period-based operation as a film festival's "singular nature" and observes the fact that "an event lasting just two weeks each year is perceived, rightly or wrongly, as unlikely to carry too much influence or impact" (*Introduction*, para. 9). Indeed, it may be that this temporal characteristic – festival transience – plays an important role in the lack of research previously conducted on film festivals as subjects in cinema studies. This is an inherent characteristic of film festival operation and will be discussed later in this chapter.

In order to confidently apply OST in a manner that is indicative of the unique nature of film festival operation, the ten characteristics identified by Katz and Kahn require further interpretation with respect to their particular applicability to film festival functionality. Such an interpretation is not a modification of OST, but rather, a framing of the theory so as to produce an applicable, accurate and particularised model of film festival operation, thereby extending its use as a conceptual model by aligning it more closely to those features which the field of study has been noted to require.

For the purpose of this thesis, this modified application will be referred to as an Open System Model (OSM) so as not to confuse the concepts and ideas proposed by the author with those original to OST. The construction of this model begins by identifying those open system characteristics that are directly applicable to understanding film festival operation. Though Katz and Kahn (1978) specify ten characteristics of an open system, this model will, for ease of explication, recognise only the first four as being critical when formulating a representation of basic functionality. These four characteristics are:

- the importation of energy;
- the throughput of energy;
- the output of energy; and
- the cycle of operation (re-energisation of the environment).

The six remaining characteristics, while integral parts of operation, are viewed as being the result of the first four characteristics and can therefore be viewed as representing a second tier of operational functioning. Such a strategy is congruent with Katz and Kahn's (1978) positing that the "basic method" of identifying social structures is to "follow the energetic chain of events from the input of energy through its transformation to the point of closure of the cycle" (p. 25), which thus essentially identifies these first four characteristics of an open system as representing the primary components of organisational functionality.

That film festival operation does indeed comply with these characteristics has already been displayed. Yet if for example, Katz and Kahn's sixth characteristic, the implementation of a corrective system, is examined with regard to film festival operation as a means of collecting and interpreting feedback, it can be seen to be *only* necessary should a film festival successfully complete a cycle of operation, and is therefore not appropriate in a model devoted to the primacy of operation. This, however, does not mean that the proposed model should only be applied when a film festival commences operation; rather, the four characteristics represent the core of operation and therefore can be applied regardless of operational longevity.

The application of this model views basic film festival operation as a logical linear progression. That is, the throughput of energy cannot precede the importation of energy. Such a progression promotes a systematic examination of film festival operation and any researcher need only 'follow the flow' of resources from input to output in order to formulate an understanding as to how any particular film festival is utilising those resources which it is importing. A film festival, as a social organisation "inscribes its processes into textual modes as a continuing feature of its existence" (Smith, 1990, p. 213). And so, should a film festival receive a resource, such as, for example, money from a sponsor, it should be *technically* possible to follow the incorporation of this resource through its textual traces in the form of bank statements, receipts, order forms, and the like, to its final outcome, be it a wage, film hire or a piece of equipment. The term *technically* is

stressed here because there is no way of determining the transparency of business within a particular film festival prior to investigation.

With this notion of a linear progression in mind, film festival operation can be understood to commence with the importation of resources. This concept mirrors the fundamental importance Parsons (1951) places on the interaction between ‘ego’ and ‘alter’. That is, the most “significant” (p. 25) aspect of a social system is the participation between the two actors. Identifying resource importation as the starting point of operation determines its importance within the operational scheme. So, if a film festival is not able to import any resources then it is physically, and indeed, logically, unable to operate. It is for this reason that the importation of resources is identified by this study as the single most important aspect of film festival operation. Without the adequate importation of resources the ability of a film festival to function is fatally compromised and failure imminent. Therefore, the importation of resources represents the first step in the operational model and is the basis from which the three remaining characteristics may be brought to bear and operation successfully completed.

This identification of importation as the initial and most important aspect of film festival operation does not devalue the remaining three characteristics identified in this model. On the contrary, and as discussed earlier, participation alone does not constitute a system, nor is the importation of resources enough to sustain film festival operation. Rather, as resources advance into throughput and output, film festival organisers must ensure that the resources are utilised in accordance with how they were first secured. The actions that proceed from importation are often representative of a film festival’s operational legitimacy, i.e., the ability of a film festival organiser to deliver those elements that determine a participant’s gratification ultimately impact on any future attempts to acquire resources from the environment. For example, should a film festival organiser successfully secure a film for exhibition, but fail to transform and output the film in a manner that satisfies the initial motivation for the resource provider’s participation, then the likely consequences are dire. Such a failure could result in: reduced motivation for future participation; a toughening of standards for continued interaction; and/or more, possibly restrictive, control over the throughput and output process. Alternatively, should the transformation and output of a resource match or exceed the resource provider’s expectations it is likely that the next cycle of input would see an increase in their level of participation. Film festival organisers who are able to show they can, for example,

successfully manage government funding may find themselves to be eligible for larger grants, thus increasing the potential “draw” they have from a particular source (Highsted in Tanner, 2009, p. 40).

The fourth and final characteristic of the proposed OSM of basic film festival functionality is the cycle of operation. This cycle is observable as a patterned activity in which a film festival re-enters the importation phase following the conclusion of an event, and is indicative of a ‘re-energisation’ of the environment.

This re-energisation is best viewed as the moving of participants towards a renewed interaction with the film festival and is not limited to previous participants, but may include new participants as well. As previously mentioned, Parsons (1951) notes that action which occurs within a social system is often the result of ‘ego’ appealing to the gratification-based needs of ‘alter’. So, this OSM identifies re-energisation as the process by which film festival organisers prove the value of participation by successfully delivering to the needs and expectations of the resource providers. This re-energisation is considered a process because it involves a comprehensive understanding of the social conditions that motivate resource provider participation; the winning of awards, access to distribution, generation of media coverage, etc., are all aspects of interaction that can be seen to motivate specific resource providers towards participation in a film festival.

A film festival must re-energise its environment in order to be able to replace those resources spent through operation. Without an influx of new resources, entropy would overcome the film festival and performance levels would fall, if not cease all together. It is possible for some outputs of film festival operation to be re-deployed as inputs by festival organisers, e.g., the Box Office from ticket sales can be reapplied towards the operational costs of the next film festival. However, the re-applicability of exported resources is only a characteristic of a select number of tangible and service-based items. These items can be deemed generic in the sense that they can be reused for operational needs that do not require specialisation, e.g., administrative costs. For the most part, the majority of resources imported into a film festival are specialised in the sense that they cannot be reused. Iordanova (2009) characterises the single use nature of most film festival resources by referring to them as “perishable” and having “only a limited shelf life” (p. 25).

This ‘limited shelf life’ is often seen in the programming of commercial films that typically have, as dictated by the distributor or rights holder, a designated number of

screenings allotted per festival. Independent film producer, Henry Rosenthal (in Tanner, 2009), explains this aspect of exhibition further: “As a producer, I have one special commodity – the first showing of a film. Films have almost no shelf life, no life span. Once you show a film, it’s already old” (p. 35). Such a mindset seeks primarily to protect a film from overexposure, but works also to the advantage of a film festival in that it promotes the uniqueness of a screening. Cathy Robinson (2006), president of the Sydney Film Festival from 2000 to 2005, explains this as a “see it here, now” phenomenon that provides an important motivation for audience participation at a film festival. Stringer (2003), Cheung (2009) and Highsted (in Tanner, 2009) also reference this phenomenon, explaining that it presents a socially unique opportunity for audience participants to relish. Such motivation would most likely be diminished should a film festival re-screen the same films in consecutive years.

It is important to note that motivation is not the only factor that influences the re-energisation of the environment; the availability of resources also plays a major role. As previously mentioned film festivals are unique open system organisations because they are sites of exhibition. This role as exhibitor, and the consequent requirement that imported resources be in their final stages of completion, positions events so that they come to have a special type of dependency upon their environment: a film cannot be imported like raw resources, but must be at a stage of completion that is acceptable for an audience to watch. Noah Cowan, Co-Director of the Toronto International Film Festival, provides insight into this situation explaining that while Toronto may screen one or two “works in progress” the rest of the program consists of films that are 95 per cent to 98 per cent finished (Harris, 2004b, para. 7). Similarly, sources of funding and audience members may not be ready to immediately re-engage with the film festival, but may require time before participating again. So, while re-motivation to interact with a film festival may be instantaneous, the physical re-energisation of the environment may take an extended amount of time. It is this time needed for the environment to become re-energised that contributes to that unique characteristic of film festivals of short but intense periods of operation previously discussed.

Having outlined the conceptual framework of OSM, this study will now discuss the practical application of the model. The following table represents the four components identified as being of primary significance to film festival operation and, for ease of explication the four components have been designated as phases to indicate the progression

of operation. Due to the fact that re-energisation is directly connected with the importation of new resources, it too is labelled as Phase 1. However, a decimal point has been added so as to represent the cyclical nature of festival operation by assigning to the value “ n ” the number of times this phase has been entered into. This method of recognising continuous film festival operation is congruent with the commonly used term *edition* employed by film industry practitioners when discussing a specific year of operation. For example, Kevin Kriedemann (2009) begins his *Variety Online* article stating that the, “30th edition of the Durban Film Festival, running July 22-Aug.2, will unspool 137 films to some 20,000 people across the coastal South African city” (para. 1). Thus, in the case of the Durban Film Festival its cycle of operation, or re-energisation, would be Phase 1.29.

Input	Transformation	Output	Re-energisation
Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 1.n

The characteristics of each phase, including their points of commencement and conclusion, will now be discussed in detail. It is important to note that the proposed OSM should be seen as descriptive rather than prescriptive. That is, the model does not address specific aspects of individual operation, e.g., it does not attempt to explain *how* film festival organisers should solicit film entires. It does serve, however as a means of identifying those processes that drive functionality.

Input – phase 1

This first phase sees the securing of a resource from the environment. By ‘securing’ it is meant that the resource comes under the control of the film festival organiser. Such control can be identified in the depositing of money into a bank account, the receiving of a film by the print handler, or even the arrival of a guest at the film festival. It is important to note that until the resource is under the management of the film festival organisers, it cannot be considered to be a guaranteed input. As much as one would wish, promises, legal contracts, business deals and handshakes do not constitute guarantees; circumstances may change that can keep a promised resource from entering into the film festival regardless of the assurances made for its potential importation. The unexpected arrest and subsequent detention of Polish film director Roman Polanski by Swiss Authorities while en route to the Swiss-based *Zurich Film Festival* is just one example of the uncertainly endemic to

resource importation. Needless to say the unanticipated incarceration of the festival guest left the festival organiser “shocked and unable to comprehend this situation, which has affected us deeply” (Macnab, 2009, para. 8). In fact, Highsted (in Tanner, 2009) explains how he tries to secure the physical film print from its source seven days prior to its scheduled screening at a festival, noting that issues with customs, or with print quality, e.g., the potential for a print to have sustained damage, can take time to overcome and must be taken into consideration (p. 46). Charles Masters (2004) gives two accounts of secured films being effectively “stolen” by other film festivals at the “eleventh hour” just before physical operation (para. 5). It is for this reason that this phase is identified as beginning with control of the resource being given to the film festival organisers, thus effectively reducing the likelihood of such theft or resource withdrawal.

The importation of a resource can only be said to have concluded when that resource begins its transformation, in the second phase of operation. The point at which this takes place can be, by its very contingency, difficult to ascertain, since different resources may be incorporated into an operation in a multitude of different ways. The defining feature of the input-transformation barrier is a change in the physical properties of the resources. So, for example, funding allocated to a film festival can be transformed by being transferred into a distributor’s bank account to pay the hire fees of a film. The act of transferring the funding changes the physical properties of the original resource so that it has, in effect, now become a film.

Transformation – phase 2

Transformation commences when a resource is manipulated by film festival organisers in order to perform a specific role or task. The transformation of some resources is less obvious, especially when money or physical evidence, such as a ticket, is not a part of the transformation. The selection of films for programming is a form of transformation. Robert Koehler (2009) explains that the “construction and selection of any section [of films in a program] immediately declares itself as, first of all, a critical statement, for the film festival programming is always and forever in its first place an act of criticism” (p. 82). This transformation induced by ‘criticism’ is not limited to the selection of films, but extends also to their programming into thematic groups, in that doing so instills a new understanding of individual films as being part of a collective whole. For example, in 2004 the Palm Springs Festival of Short Films programmed a section devoted to renowned feature film directors (Harris, 2004). It is highly unlikely that the early short film work of

David Lynch, Jane Campion, Spike Jonze, Francois Truffaut, Martin Scorsese, Luis Buñuel and Tim Burton had screened previously, or ever will screen again, together at a film festival; the uniqueness of such a presentation then, ultimately influences how an audience will view each title. This collective transformation is the topic of discussion in an interview between Richard Porton (2009a) and Canadian filmmaker Atom Egoyan. Egoyan expresses the opinion that the collective transformation quality of programming is the “most troubling” feature of film festivals, as it promotes a critical comparison between the various films and does not allow for an isolated viewing experience (p. 179).

Transformation ceases when the resource is finally output back into the environment where it can no longer be manipulated by the film festival organisers. The time between transformation and output is dependent upon the properties of the resource. For example, the time taken between an audience member purchasing a ticket and experiencing a film might be only a matter of minutes, yet the period of time taken to procure that film and transform it into a screened output may have been months.

Output – phase 3

This phase commences when the transformed resource enters the environment and, again, this maybe observed to happen in a number of different ways, depending upon how the transformation of the resource was accomplished. Examples of transformed resources being introduced into the environment range from the commonly observed physical screening of films to the specialised creation of a compact disc of the panel discussions that were held at and produced by the Swedish-based *Gothenburg Film Festival* (Gaydos, 1998, p. 59).

The output phase concludes when the resource has been transformed and implemented by the film festival organisers. The finality of this process can be observed in such things as festival recaps. The 2009 Italian-based Milano Film Festival, for example, issued an e-mail titled “The festival is over – See you in 2010”. This e-mail recapped the outcomes of the event by identifying that Laurence Thrush’s *Tobira no muko* had been awarded the prize for “Best Feature Film”, as well providing hypertextual links to numerous photos and videos of the event’s festivities.

It is important to note that if a transformed resource does not enter the environment then the output phase of operation cannot be seen to have been successfully completed. For example, if a reporter was to attend a film festival and interview a guest actor, yet

subsequently not publish the interview, the output with respect to those specific individuals' transformation from their role as an input resource would not have been achieved.

Re-energisation – phase 1.n

As previously discussed, re-energisation is the re-motivation of resource providers to participate in a future cycle of film festival operation. Strategies to re-motivate participants can occur almost instantaneously with the output of resources: a 'strike while the iron is hot' mentality. Alternatively, months may elapse before re-motivation commences, be it in the form of an acquittal which documents how funds supplied to a film festival were used, or as a new project proposal with critical data from the last event. Such aspects of film festival operation are contingent on the ways in which individual film festival organisers approach each of their individual resource providers. The crucial aspect of re-energisation is that the benefits of participation must have an observable effect. That is, if the positive aspects of involvement are unknown it is highly unlikely that resource providers will be motivated to participate. In such scenarios awards become indispensable because the film festival organisers are able to effectively control how re-energisation is perceived. For example, the Belgium-based *Flanders Film Festival* awarded Hirozaku Kore-Eda's film *Nobody Knows* the festival's Grand Prize of \$25,000 towards distribution (Graydon, 2004). In a case such as this filmmaking participants are able to observe the benefits of interaction. Mark Fiskin (in Tanner, 2009) recalls that "I've had filmmakers say to us [Mill Valley Film Festival], 'well, if you gave awards, we'd be more likely to give you our film'" (p. 27).

It is to the advantage of film festival organisers to identify the benefits of participation in their event, since "every festival likes to point to certain films and say 'it was because that film played in this festival that it got a distribution deal, because it was a hit here, this is where it started'" (Rosenthal in Tanner, 2009, p. 34). Such acknowledgements provide proof of the benefits of involvement and may be the difference in motivating a specific resource provider to participate in one event over another.

However, it is important to note that not all benefits presented/provided by film festivals will be interpreted as being useful. For example, Bola Adewara (1999) titles his *Sunday Vanguard* newspaper article 'We are not interested in FESPACO now' and discusses the disillusionment Nigerian videomakers felt after they had participated in the one of

Africa's largest film events. Tony Rayns (in Tanner, 2009) holds that "most festival prizes have absolutely no meaning to anyone anywhere" (p. 91). An additional expression of discontentment is made by Rosenthal (in Tanner, 2009) who notes that filmmakers are often "exploited" by film festivals because the events rarely offer anything more than a venue to screen their work (p. 33).

Such opinions are legitimate criticisms and are a direct consequence of film festivals operating as social systems. The challenge of re-energisation lies in understanding what benefits participants are most likely to value. For example, Emile Fallaux (in Tanner, 2009), former director of the International Film Festival Rotterdam (1991-1996) identifies one of the "major" benefits for a filmmaker participating in a film festival as "exposure to serious criticism" (p. 57). This viewpoint is shared by Stephen Teo (2009) who viewed Chinese filmmakers' participation in the Hong Kong International Film Festival as a "morale booster" because they were able to submit and screen films that did not have a commercial style (p. 110).

It is the re-energisation aspect of basic film festival operation that gives OSM a true social structure. As Katz and Kahn (1978) explain,

a simple linear stimulus-response exchange between two people would not constitute social structure. To create structure, the responses of A would have to elicit B's reaction in such a manner that the responses of the latter would stimulate A to further responses. (p. 24)

Thus, in order for a film festival to achieve effective re-energisation organisers must be aware of, and consider the feedback from their participants. If this does not occur then participants may question their future involvement, and those resources the event relies upon for its operation may become unattainable.

The re-energisation phase ends with the importation of new resources into the film festival which effectively concludes a cycle of operation when importation for the next edition begins. If film festival organisers are unable to re-energise the environment, then this phase of operation could be on-going, as new approaches are undertaken to try and re-motivate the requirements for interaction.

This thesis proposes that the four phases of this model constitute a logical and most importantly, a practical means of both identifying and understanding the primary aspects of film festival operation. As previously mentioned, advanced aspects of film festival

operation such as the intergration of feedback are observable. Yet the fact that film festival operation is intrinsically connected to the importation of resources and is presented by the current work as (reiterations of) a single cycle, the point at which the cycle begins anew presents an opportune point of departure from which more advanced examinations into film festival functionality may be undertaken.

It is the contention of the present study that attention to the importation of resources can be used to better understand the organisational behaviour of film festivals. That is, through the identification of importation as the single most important aspect in film festival functionality, a rationalisation of the more perplexing issues surrounding film festival operation becomes achievable. An importation-based approach perceives a ‘call for entries’, for example, as no longer *just* a means of programming a festival, but rather views this ubiquitous activity as a method by which film festival organisers try to overcome the depletory effects of entropy.

The insight gained by viewing film festivals in such a manner enables academics and industry practitioners alike to discuss aspects of film festival operation that have previously been too difficult to contextualise. Film festival operation is often, for example, referred to as being politically-driven (Gore, 2001; Beauchamp & Behar, 1992; Smith, 1999; Turan, 2003; Webber, 2005), and this concept of politics may be linked to the power attributed to film festivals to make important decisions; by defining what constitutes a worthy or award winning film, for example, or by exhibiting a film which takes a particular ideological standpoint regarding national or international affairs. This is an inherent condition of film festivals operating as social systems and since “[p]ower is inseparable from interaction” (Clegg, Courpasson & Phillips, 2006, p. 6) film festivals, being the endpoint of interaction, are often identified as being the perpetrators of political machinations. These may range from the perceived favoritism of juries towards particular films (Ebert, 1987, p. 182), to the underlying motivations of film festival organisers for facilitating a film festival in the first place. The most well-known example of the latter being the instituting of the Venice International Film Festival, which is widely recognised as having been a propagandistic arm of the Fascist Italian Government in the 1930s (Stone, 2002; Bart, 1998; Beauchamp & Behar, 1992; Turan, 2003).

However, this thesis contends that the politics observed in the majority of film festivals is attributable more to those compromises event organisers must make in order to

secure external participation than to blatant agenda setting. This is a concept in agreeance with Peranson (2009) who identifies film festivals as being “subject to pressures from interest groups” which ultimately influence how they operate (p. 25). These ‘pressures’ arise because film festivals are in fact only one aspect of a diverse and well-developed exhibition branch of contemporary cinema and are consequently required to conform to many external influences. In a form of ‘guilt by association’, film festivals are consequently also held accountable for the politics of the actors they rely on for resources. SECOR Consulting (2004) confirms this situation by indicating how film festivals must “answer to a variety of stakeholders, including local communities, industry professionals and public institutions” (p. 21).

An example of the unpredictability of festival operation of this kind occurred at the 2009 edition of the Melbourne International Film Festival when organisers experienced critical backlash from Chinese nationals as a result of programming a highly-politicised documentary. The inclusion of the controversial film, *The 10 Conditions of Love* (2009) by Uighur director Rebiya Kadeer resulted in a loss of funding from the Hong Kong Economic and Trade Office as well as the pulling of several films by Chinese filmmakers who disagreed with the inclusion of what they considered to be an inflammatory work. The film festival also sustained a number of cyber attacks on its website; the most successful of which hijacked the landing page and demanded an apology to China from event’s organisers for the film’s selection (AP, 2009; Boland, 2009b).

Interestingly, in an unrelated incident, British filmmaker Ken Loach also pulled his film, *Looking for Eric* (2009), from the 2009 Melbourne International Film Festival. Loach’s reasons for withdrawal were connected to the festival receiving money from the Israeli Embassy to host the director of the Israeli/Australian co-production *\$9.99* (2009). As reported by CBC News (2009) “Loach wrote to festival director Richard Moore, saying he was not protesting Israeli films or filmmakers, but objected to Israel’s ‘illegal occupation of Palestinian land, destruction of homes and livelihoods’” (para. 4). Both of these examples illustrate the complex and often conflicting nature of external participation. It is important to note that the film festival’s organisers issued statements regarding their programming choices, even going as far as to call Loach’s request “blackmail” (Moore in CBC, 2009, para. 5), and refused to give in to either the Chinese or Loach’s demands.

From an open system perspective, the fact that the organisers stood their ground demonstrated the strength of their resolve and their control over the situation – put simply they, needed to find additional participants to fill the vacancies left by the withdrawn resources. Should they have capitulated and been seen to accommodate the demands, the legitimacy of the film festival could have been called into question by other participants and have potentially caused more resource providers to re-negotiate their requirements for participation in the future. Indeed, the festival was even able to take advantage of the situation to enhance participation. As a result of the controversy Moore was noted to have been “reveling in the publicity”, using the enhanced media coverage to tout MIFF’s legitimacy as an “indie arts org”; sessions to all screenings of the film sold out and a further screening had to be programmed (Boland, 2009b, para. 6).

Knowing exactly what drives a film festival to ‘answer’ the demands of external participants can provide valuable insight into the behavioral aspects of film festival operation, and an OSM presents a logical and systematic method of tracing the event organisers’ decision-making processes. The requirements of a particular funding body may inspire film festival organisers to create or align their film festival with other external events. The *Denver International Film Festival* (DIFF), for example, introduced a ‘Film on the Rock’ series to boost the annual attendance of the festival, thus making the organisation eligible for funding by the Scientific & Cultural Facilities District (Henderson, 2004). In this case the decision to stage a secondary film event can be traced back to the film festival organisers’ desire to have access to more potential income from an actor in their immediate environment. Such actions can be seen to be more utilitarian than Machiavellian in intent in that they are aimed at being of use to the ongoing functioning of the *festival*, rather than serving some political end extraneous to the event.

Similarly, an OSM enables examinations to be conducted with regard to the importation (or non-importation) of films. Peranson (2009) is correct in contending that it is just as interesting and important to examine those films which festivals don’t screen – such as the films they are unable to secure for programming – as it is to investigate “what they do show” (p. 37). Peranson is alluding here to the demands distributors, producers, and now, most commonly, sales agents make of film festivals in order that they may have access to high profile films. The power of the resource provider to withhold films, funding, attendance, etc., enables them to exert a sometimes excessive control over film festival operation. It soon becomes obvious that operating a film festival goes far beyond the basic

requirement of compiling films to be screened, and instead involves a continuous decision-making process as to which external actors are needed for operation and what compromises should be made relative to their level of involvement, in addition to assessments of the timeliness of their participation.

Types and level of involvement

Much has been written that both identifies and discusses the role of external participants in film festival operation. Peranson (2009) identifies seven interest groups consisting of: Distributors/Buyers, Sales Agents, Sponsors, Government, Audience, Critics and Filmmakers. Similarly, Rhyne (2009) identifies five groups of stakeholders who have a vested interest in film festivals: “These groups are 1) filmmakers and producers, 2) journalists, 3) the film industry financiers, lawyers, distributors and studios, 4) tourists [*sic*] and ancillary industries, and policymakers, funders and festival managers” (p. 17). Many other authors have also extended their research and comments in this area (Beauchamp & Behar, 1992; Ebert, 1987; Smith, 1999; Hope, 2004; Webber, 2005; de Valck, 2007).

Film festival organisers must make calculated decisions as to those participants who are deemed necessary for operation. The incorporation of each external participant inevitably complicates operation as individual actors expect the social values, beliefs, perceptions, etc., under which they have agreed to participate to be upheld, and to ultimately form “the agreed upon definition of membership, boundaries and activities”, or collective identity (Johnston *et al.*, 1994, p. 15) of the festival. The establishment of this ‘definition of membership’ requires the festival organisers to use foresight as the collective identity of organisations is understood to be formed through interaction (Taylor & Whittier, 1992). Thus, while a framework for basic participatory behaviour may exist, to a large extent, the majority of the collective identity which determines the functional parameters of the film festival is developed between the event organisers and their respective participants.

In conjunction with his two festival model, Mark Peranson (2009) lists, in order of importance, the exact placement of the seven interest groups he identifies as being involved in film festival operation. In this ranking system he identifies, logically enough, the Distributors/Buyers group as the primary participant of the Business film festival model while obviously ranking the Audience first in the Audience film festival model (p. 28). Peranson thus acknowledges a hierarchy of resources in relation to the control over

operation which he understands film festival organisers are willing to accept. Organisers of the Business film festival model are more likely to adhere to the conditions of participation of the top three interest groups (Distributors/Buyers, Sales Agents and Sponsors) because they are key actors in facilitating a business-orientated operation. Similar participant-based rankings are observed by Ruby Cheung (2009) who explains that as the *Hong Kong International Film Festival* became more “corporatised” there was the potential for audience members to “move down from the top of the festival’s stakeholder list to be replaced by film industry practitioners and commercial sponsors” (p. 113). Rosenthal (in Tanner, 2009) concurs by commenting that his “feeling is that filmmaker’s interests are the last consideration on their [film festival organisers’] minds. They would rather please their sponsors than filmmakers” (p. 35).

Peranson acknowledges flaws with his ranking system in that it does not account for the individual nature of film festival operation, or as he explains “each festival should be treated on its own strengths, and with the knowledge of the limits that it’s under” (p. 37). However, the information he provides strengthens the validity of using importation as a means of understanding the organisational behaviour of film festivals.

Timeliness of participation

The second part of the film festival organisers’ decision-making process is the timeliness of interaction. Much of what a film festival is dependent upon for operation is not available a year-round. For example, funding organisations such as the Japanese Foundation only accept submissions up to a particular, specified date, and those film festivals that fail to submit or are rejected, must wait until the next round of funding opens. Similarly, the programming of certain films is often affected by distributor release dates, and by conflicting bookings with other film festivals. Peranson (2009) provides further insight into the challenges that arise between time and resource availability by explaining that “[m]ost of the time there is only one English-subtitled print of [a newly released] film in the world – a film can only be in one place at one time” (p. 25).

The reality that the resources required for operation are rarely available upon demand contributes to the unique organisational structure of film festivals. It was previously mentioned that film festival are unlike other open system organisations because they are sites of exhibition and therefore subject to a range of unique operational considerations, such as the availability of finalised product. Iordanova (2009) comments on

this condition by stating that “the main challenge for festivals is to establish a model that can function as (or at least resemble) a steady supply chain and simultaneously accommodate the realities of their discontinuity” (p. 26).

This ‘discontinuity’ of resources poses the single largest threat to film festival operation and is what the OSM terms entropy. When a resource is no longer available film festival organisers must make structural adjustments in order to curb its entropic impacts. For example, when, in 2009 the *Bangkok International Film Festival* had its budget reduced by Bt120 million (AUD\$3.8 million), organisers compensated for the lack of funding by reducing the total number of films programmed and shifting the focus away from titles typically more expensive due to transportation and film hire costs (Pajee, 2009).

The concept of entropy holds that any system will continue towards disorganisation if resources are not replenished at a rate consistent with their expenditure. Entropy plays a critical role within the OSM since it drives film festival organisers to address the ‘realities of discontinuity’ by appealing to their environment for inputs on a recurring basis; an aspect that is reaffirmed by the model’s emphasis on the cyclical pattern of importation. It is through the acknowledgement of entropy’s role that a more comprehensive understanding of the idiosyncratic nature film festival operation can be rationalised. Mention has been made of the transient nature of festival operation and this manifests itself in a continual need and effort to replenish resources such as funding, films, volunteers and festival guests, in a staggered, contingent manner so designed to meet the demands of operation at appropriate times. This is a subject Iordanova (2009) touches upon when she discusses the requirement film festival have for films, but only at a particular phase of their operation (p. 25).

Entropy can disrupt a film festival in many, unexpected ways. This is a common and recurring topic raised in the numerous interviews conducted by Laurie Tanner (2009) with a range of veteran film festival organisers. For example Tim Highsted, an organiser of both the *London* and *San Francisco Film Festivals* explains that “the golden rule is just to be aware of what your resources are... that you’re not over-reaching yourself, which is very easy to do in a festival” (p. 50). Similarly, Bob Hawk, Founder and Former Director of the American-based *Film Arts Festival* expresses the need to “squeeze as much out of each day as possible”, and for film festival organisers to be conscious of when their resources are being “maxed out” (p. 62).

The sporadic availability of resources also poses its challenges in the time immediately following operation. In fact, the post-operation period poses one of the most vulnerable times for a film festival as the majority of resources have been utilised through operation, and the likelihood of additional resource provider interaction is inherently low due to the extended period of time before the next event. This key theme is touched on by Lorena Cantrell, a former Associate Director of the San Francisco International Film Festival, who explains volunteers rarely participated in a film festival following operation as “the fun’s all over” (p. 117). Michael Lumpkin, former director of the *San Francisco International Lesbian and Gay Film Festival*, points out that the mistakes made by film festival organisers are often compounded because they cannot be corrected until the next event, which generally means in a year’s time (p. 128).

The inability to immediately correct operational or social mistakes can have a disastrous effect on film festival functionality. Mark Fishkin, founder and executive director of the Mill Valley Film Festival explains that the “greatest detriment to (start-up) festivals is being overly ambitious and getting yourself in a deficit position” (p. 24). Similar advice is given by Deborah Kaufman, former director of the *San Francisco Jewish Film Festival*, who recommends that new festivals just “keep the program small enough that you’re not going to lose a lot of money... Keep it small and contain it, don’t go overboard with your budget” (p. 84).

In order to better understand how film festival organisers deal with the timeliness of participation, this study identifies and discusses three types of entropy-induced activity periods that are addressed by film festival organisers during operation. The critical aspect of these periods is that the organisers, for a period of time, attempt to match and even to exceed the inevitable entropic effects of operation, in the final case even temporarily storing resources for later use at peak operation.

Financially-driven entropy

This form of entropy stems from the economic requirements that occur during operation and includes, but is not limited to costs associated with programming, guests and operations. This study identifies both monetary contributions as well as in-kind contributions, such as the donation of goods or services, as financial resources. Both of these resource types are considered equally important to operation, since in-kind contributions may enable the film festival to make a profit, as when organisers do not have

to pay any overhead costs for the use of donated venues, equipment, or the like (Henderson in Tanner, 2009, p. 124).

The financial budgets of film festivals vary individually, yet there is an observed standard pool from which the majority of financial-based resources originate. Cathy Robinson (2006), Simon Field (in Quandt, 2009), Emile Fallaux (in Tanner, 2009) and Deborah Kaufman (in Tanner, 2009), all explain that their event's financial base is evenly distributed between three distinct funding sources: government grants, private sponsorship and earned income, e.g., ticket sales.

This diversification of resource suppliers enables film festival organisers to avoid an over-dependency upon one specific source of funding. As explained by Kaufman, “[o]ur stability and our strength has to do with our [mix of funding] – it's 1/3 earned income, 1/3 donations and 1/3 grants” (p. 82). This ‘stability’ and ‘strength’ stems from the likelihood that if a financial contributor should not participate the event will still be able to function. In 2004, for example, the *Montréal World Film Festival* lost over C\$1.5 million dollars (AUD\$1.54 million) in funding support from its Canadian government sponsors (Kelly, 2004). However, the 2005 edition of the festival was still able to operate on the financial support received from private sponsors, including Air Canada, AGF and Visa. By 2007 organisers were able to reactivate the government public funding stream, and indeed increase it from C\$190,000 (AUD\$195,000) in 2006, to C\$850,000 (AUD\$874,000) (Kelly, 2007, para. 15).

Financial resources are generally acquired prior to the facilitation of the physical event, and so film festival organisers engage and interact with finance-based resource providers before any other types of resource providers, though film festival organisers may use the participation of a key individual, such as a Hollywood actor, to make involvement more appealing. The timing of this engagement is often the result of the financial calendars. So, for example, proposals may be submitted to private business so as to take advantage of new sponsorship opportunities; or, in the case of cultural funding, to correspond with an assessment period which can take anywhere from one to six months.

An additional challenge that stems from financially-driven entropy is the fact that much of the funding allocated to a film festival is designated for specific application and is therefore restricted in terms of how it is used. So money, and especially that which is provided by a government agency, is often supplied only to be used to facilitate certain

approved activities stipulated in the funding proposal. Larry Horne (in Tanner, 2009), founder and former director of the *Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Film Festival*, notes that a grant received from the California Council on the Humanities had to be used to stage “a conference around the issues of gay and lesbian identity in the media” (p. 102). The restrictive nature of such funding allocations means that a film festival may ultimately experience financial entropy even though it has money available. Such situations often require organisers to make payment-related sacrifices in order for money to be reallocated to those areas crucial to functionality. Fishkin (in Tanner, 2009), notes that the film festival organisers’ salaries “didn’t become stable until somewhere between our fifth and eight years” (p. 26). A similar statement is made by Gretchen Elsner-Sommer (in Tanner, 2009) who explains the organisers of the American-based *Women in the Director’s Chair Film Festival* were not paid until their eighth year of operation (in Tanner, 2009, p. 100).

Operations-driven entropy

Operations-driven entropy refers to resources such as films and venues which exist in finite quantities in the environment and are consequently of limited availability. These resources are required for operation and often have what has been referred to as a ‘limited shelf life’, both in terms of appeal, and their incorporation into the film festival. For example, Parinyaporn Pajee (2009) reports that the Bangkok International Film Festival could not secure theatres during its scheduled dates of operation, which resulted in a rescheduling of the event to a time when venues were available. Another example of a rapidly encroaching threat of operations-driven entropy is provided by J. David Slocum (2009), who relates the *Zanzibar International Film Festival*’s experience of the closing of “the island’s last three commercial cinemas” (p. 141). Such a situation is justifiably a cause for alarm for the event’s organisers since an absence of venue makes film festival functionality logically impossible.

The type and degree of operations-driven entropy is unique to each film festival. For example, not all film festivals require the same number of films for programming – the first *Durban Film Festival* screened only seven titles (Kriedemann, 2009) while up to 400 films are regularly included into the Berlin International Film Festival’s public program (Berlin, 2009). It can, however, be argued that each event has a critical mass of resources that must be utilised. This critical mass is often indicative of the goals of the film festival organisers, but also may be linked to funding, since many government organisations will

sometimes stipulate that a certain number and type of films must be included in order to fulfil requirements for payment.

That a film festival requires a certain amount of resources for operation makes this type of entropy especially challenging to counter since the environment may not have enough resources to match the needs of certain film festivals. Quintín (2009) explains that the program of a contemporary “mid-sized festival (let’s say, about 200 films) is equivalent to what one used to be able to see throughout the year in first-run cinemas” (p. 40). This expansion of programming has a dramatic effect on how film festivals are able to operate. For example, Mark Cousins (2009) explains that although 3,000 films are produced yearly, “at most, only 150 of the annual 3,000 films are of real artistic merit” (p. 155). Similar sentiments are expressed by Robert Koehler (2009) who identifies the number of “films that truly matter” produced in any one year as being under forty (p. 87) and James Quandt (2009) who lowers that number to ten to twenty “good-to-great” films produced annually (p. 67).

This situation places enormous stress on film festival organisers as it creates a competitive environment between events which is exacerbated by the limited windows of opportunity to actually screen the film before it is commercially released. This effective ‘starvation of resources’ has a trickle down effect as Quandt (2009) explains:

The essential point in all of this is that there are only so many crucial and necessary films to go around, and smaller festivals assuming that they can premiere important or even just quality films are generally deluding themselves. (p. 88)

Operations-driven entropy (though not identified and named as such) was a major cause for concern among all FIAPF accredited A-list film festivals, as Mark Cousins (2009) explains:

To qualify, each of the 12 [A-listed film festivals] must have a competition section containing at least *14 world premiered* films. So each year, the A listers alone have at least 168 slots for new films to fill which means, in theory, swallowing up all 150 of the good movies of the year. (p. 155)

A similar observation was made by Quintín (2009) who explains the A-list requirements are essentially flawed because “there are not enough films to premiere in order to fulfil expectations, since the producers all attempt to get their films into Cannes first and

secondly into Venice or Berlin” (p. 42). FIAPF solved this entropic problem in 2004 by revising the rules to reflect the realities of film availability (Masters, 2004).

Additional examples of how operations-driven entropy influences the decision making process of film festival organisers can be observed in venue selection and engagement. As previously mentioned, the availability of venues is always a concern when organising a film festival, and some of the more original methods of overcoming this entropy-driven challenge include modifying other, abundant resources into a venues. Lateral thinking by the Canadian-based *Whistler Film Festival* enabled the utilisation of a projection surface made entirely of snow, and the British-based *Leeds International Film Festival* made similar use of the façade of the Queen’s Hotel as a projection surface (Cowie, 2002, p. 355).

Iordanova (2009) explains that recognition of the “primacy of a venue in the study of festival” enables research to better understand “the various efforts festivals make in order to overcome the shortcomings of their idiosyncratic and limited supply chain” (p. 26). Many of these ‘idiosyncrasies’ become costly, as the hiring a venue that is well-suited to both the needs of the audience and the technical aspects of projection can be extremely expensive. In fact, Jim Yee (in Tanner, 2009), founder of the *San Francisco International Asian American Film Festival* emphatically warns others to be “very cautious of any kind of venue” (p. 142); a warning of the fact that an audience is not guaranteed and that film festival organisers must be aware that the money spent on venue hire may not be recovered in box office income. This is a topic covered in great detail by Gary Meyer (in Tanner, 2009), co-founder of Landmark Theatres and co-director of the American-based *Telluride Film Festival*, who explains from the perspective of the theatre owner that

whatever price we [the theatre] ultimately decide upon for the rental of the theater, you’re [the festival organiser] responsible for that...I don’t want you coming back to me begging for a reduction in terms. I can’t do that when you haven’t sold enough tickets. (p. 73)

Participation-driven entropy

Participation-based resources are vulnerable to entropy because they require physical attendance at the event, in the form of entertainment reporters, audience members, filmmakers, etc.; all are required to attend in order to fulfil the requirements of input, transformation and output of an open system. This physical participation is needed as a

means of validating the relevance of a film festival through audience statistics, media articles and the recorded and transmitted attendance of film industry icons which are often used as proof of the event's appeal, and which can be used to motivate future participation of other resource providers. The Slovakian-based *Art Film Fest* (AFF, 2009) was eager to boast that it had "record attendance" at its 2009 edition (para. 1), and similar observations validating the importance of participation can be found on the Internet-based database *filmfestivalworld.com* (FFW, 2008) which divides participation into three lists: Attendance, Media Attendance, and Accredited Industry Attendance.

This type of entropy sees participants "burnout" (Highsted in Tanner, 2009, p. 47; Cantrell in Tanner, 2009, p. 116), be they audience members, film industry personnel or volunteers. Ron Henderson (in Tanner, 2009), executive director of the Denver International Film Festival, equates the taxing effect of film festival operation upon a festival's "human resources" to that of "dollar resources" (p. 124), adding that DIFF is particularly fortunate in that it has a "very low turnover" of those seasonal workers who contribute to the continuity of the event's operation (p. 124).

'Burnout' is often blamed for the difficulty film festivals have in sustaining volunteer support over an extended amount of time. The Toronto International Film Festival begins to slowly recruit its volunteers at the beginning of May, peaking with the festival's operation in September (SECOR, 2004). Most film festival organisers plan volunteer involvement to correspond with periods of high activity so as to use resources in the form of human activity to their full effect, as well as to be able to provide a benefit, in the form of attendance, for those who are participating.

An additional effect of this specific type of entropy on film festival operation involves the characteristic period-based functioning of the events. As previously mentioned, film festivals must allow their environments to re-energise before they are able to import additional resources. The fact that this re-energising may take an extended amount of time means that the operational structure of film festivals must not be overly demanding in terms of work. Such operational techniques are indicative of the 'down times' or 'seasonal work' characteristic indicative of most film festivals. Fishkin (in Tanner, 2009) explains that

cash flows are tight and you have to develop your year-round staff very slowly...

So you wind up trying to make do with a limited year-round staff covering a lot of different positions, and then you bring on people seasonally. (p. 25)

SECOR Consulting (2004) reports that both the *Atlantic Film Festival* and Vancouver International Film Festival have a permanent staff of eight or nine employees that increases to “70 during festival period” (p. 26).

Conclusion

To summarise, the three types of entropy identified by this study provide a comprehensive approach to the understanding of the resource-driven conditions under which film festival operation occurs. However, it is important to note that the specific *types* discussed by this study are a part of an entropic whole. That is, entropy itself is a complete disorganising force and the delineation of these three types of resource depletion is employed to present the information in more meaningful manner. Through the use of the OSM, the importation of resources is seen as a necessary functional aspect used to promote negative entropy and ultimately enable the longevity of operation. There is however need for future research on this topic, including examination of effective techniques of slowing of operation and relying upon stored resources. It is typical for film festivals to attempt to slow entropy by limiting organisational activity and utilise resources that may have been stored for such a reason. Such operational techniques are indicative of the ‘down times’ experienced by the majority of film festivals. In such a way film festival organisers are able to maintain operation during lulls in importation; by, in effect, entering a reduced operational period. Such a technique effectively forestalls the disorganising effects of entropy until new resources are secured. The analogous technique of holding festivals on a biannual basis as a means of promoting negative entropy – or to avoid the depletion of resources (which this thesis argues are one and the same) – is also an aspect of festival operation that holds much potential for future research.

Disadvantages with the open system paradigm model

This OSM has been shown to display several advantages in its ability to promote a logical understanding of film festival operation, but it is not without its disadvantages. Chief among these is the fact that the model places the majority of its understanding on the structure and function of film festivals. It could be argued that such a pragmatic examination has the potential to overlook the social aspects of operation. However, the social aspects of interaction cannot be quantified into a structural model because they are

never truly *known*. That is, the beliefs, perceptions and motivations that drive resource providers to participate in a film festival are individual to each participant, and an aspect may inspire a particular type of individual to interact in one way may cause another to disengage. This is part of what is termed here as the complexity of operation.

The concern of the current study is with a basic model of film festival operation. Exploration into those intricacies and complex contingencies to be found when dealing with individuals, and individual situations, during festival operation, lies beyond the scope of the current work. It can, however, be confidently contended that OSM provides an appropriate starting point from which to commence such a study.

Katz and Kahn (1978) explain that there “is no anatomy to a social system” (p. 36) and that an organisation is only represented by the occurrence of “events or happenings rather than of physical parts” (p. 36). As has been noted, film festivals have a unique period-based operational structure that makes examination even more difficult to accomplish. It therefore befits this field of study to utilise a model that provides a structural framework to which aspects of operational complexity may be referenced. As, for example, grappling with the challenges associated with collective identity. Collective identity is that process whereby participants invest their personal ideas and values into an organisation and can provide greater security for the organisation, in the form of assurances of resource input, since by viewing themselves as integral to the organisation, they are less likely to withdraw. However, film festivals typically have several participants, each with their own contributions, who struggle and conflict to shape the identity of the event according to their own designs. These contributions, while obviously important, are the source of many operational difficulties with the potential to undermine operation, and provide organisers with much to do in the way of negotiation and accommodation. For example, Beauchamp and Behar (1992), comment on how the participation of both the American and Russian governments at the Cannes Film Festival during the Cold War presented event organisers with numerous challenging operational situations, ranging from strategically-planned party scheduling conflicts (p. 68) to physical disruption of movie theatre sound systems due to radar interference from the American Sixth Fleet which was routinely stationed around Cannes during the festival (pp. 207-208). Suggestions for further exploration of various other manifestations of operational complexity form the basis for the final chapter.

Chapter Four

Introduction

The previous chapter identified film festivals as a special type of open system due to their exhibition-based role; a role that sees these events only able to import resources that are in a completed state, e.g., a finished film. Additionally, an open system model (OSM) of basic film festival operation was proposed based upon a four-phase process in which the importation of resources is the first and most important phase in commencing a functioning film festival. The subsequent phases – transformation, output and re-energisation – were understood to have specific roles in facilitating an on-going cycle of film festival operation. This cycle of operation is critical to the successful promotion of negative entropy. Entropy is defined by this study as the continual operations-driven expenditure of acquired resources which moves a film festival towards a state of disorganisation. Three specific types of entropy are identified: financial-driven, operations-driven and participation-driven.

The following chapter will expand upon this OSM by presenting methods by which film festival organisers are able to increase the likelihood of resource importation, through the implementation of eight specific strategies:

- co-operative alliances;
- date placement;
- geographic location;
- identifiable function;
- legitimising affiliations;
- participation-based incentives;
- resource control; and
- sanctioning organisations;

These strategies owe their existence to the nature of film festivals as social systems which rely on the importation of resources based upon participant motivation, which itself originates in the “gratification” received from interaction (Parsons, 1951, p. 6). While resources can never be guaranteed, their importation may be influenced by the prospect of a beneficial return as a result of participation. Jonathan Rosenbaum (2009) explains how many films programmed by the New York Film Festival “acquired US distribution *because* they’d been selected” by the film festival (p. 155, italics in original). Similarly, Craig Alexander (1997) explains that the exposure presented by film festivals presents a unique

opportunity to promote films and that “Hollywood studios such as Paramount, Warner and Miramax don’t intend to be left out when there are over 600 journalists attending” (p. 2).

These strategies, while observable in film festival operation, are not a part of the basic functional process of film festival organisation and often develop over time. Bob Hawk (in Tanner, 2009) comments that a certain amount of “lead-time and pre-production” is required before a film festival can operate properly (p. 63). This ‘lead-time’ is required because each film festival presents its own unique situational contingencies in terms of the securing of participation from resource providers. Thus, while the implementation of strategies is observed to occur on a wide scale, each event ultimately dictates both the timing and the specific strategies that are most likely to be effective in motivating participation in its particular case.

The identification and examination of methods observed to increase resource importation is congruent with this study’s previously stated objective of developing a means of predicting operational longevity. Just as Quintín (2009) is able to connect the pre-existence of “certain cultural traditions” and a “significant middle class” to the “inevitable” success of the *Buenos Aires International Festival of Independent Cinema* (p. 46), so too, can an investigation of those pre-existing operations-based traits observed to service the ‘gratification’ aspect of interaction be used to develop a more precise understanding of the role strategies play in promoting negative entropy.

This study identifies eight types of strategies used by film festival organisers in order to promote stable resource importation. The strategies are arranged alphabetically so as to remove any suggestion of preference or progression since, although some strategies may be observed to be more widely used than others, no single strategy is proposed as being ‘the best’ by this study. It is also important to note that many of these strategies are interconnected and that the total number of strategies implemented is a unique choice faced by each film festival.

Strategy one: co-operative alliances

A co-operative alliance is indicative of the partnership formed between a film festival and another organisation. This partnership is based upon reciprocal benefits for both organisations and includes the sharing of resources, e.g., films, joint applications for funding, and/or cross promotions through media and contact databases. This reciprocity-based understanding is congruent with Becky Starnes’ (2000) explanation that a “strategic

alliance may be defined as a ‘relationship developed between parties to achieve common interests’” (p. 17). Executive director of the Vancouver International Film Festival, Alan Franey (in Tanner, 2009), notes the importance of “piggybacking” resources with other organisations and explains that co-operation between a first-time film festival and entities such as theatres, other festivals and libraries, is an effective means of “getting something off the ground” (p. 30). Such ‘piggybacking’ can be seen with the first edition of the Norwegian-based *Bergen International Film Festival* which was held as part of the “celebration of Bergen as European City of Culture” (Cowie, 2002, p. 355). It is however, important to note that this strategy is not only used during film festival formation, but that it also occurs throughout the operation of a film festival. This is a point expanded upon by Gretchen Elsner-Sommer (in Tanner, 2009) who explains that “it’s very important to collaborate, not only with other media arts organizations, and other film and video festivals, but with community groups, educational groups, with a lot of different people” (p. 97).

The majority of co-operative alliances see film festivals performing a film-related function, e.g., the organisers of the Denver International Film Festival (DIFF) help to facilitate the *Aurora Asian Film Festival* in conjunction with the Aurora Asian/Pacific Community Partnership and the City of Aurora (AAFF, 2007). In this type of co-operative alliance the film festivals are identified as the film authorities and are therefore in charge of film-based activities.

In order for a co-operative alliance to be entered into there must be no threat of competition. That is, each entity must be seen as performing different services that do not encroach upon the availability of, or individual effectiveness in, importing resources of the other. Such a scenario once existed between film festivals and arthouse cinemas, however as Adrian Martin (2009) explains, the benefits of co-operation were soon replaced by competition for programming and, ultimately, for audiences:

For a long time, the two [film festivals and arthouse cinemas] existed in symbiosis, and events moved in lockstep: arthouse distributors would preview their latest acquisitions at a high-profile festival screening... This relationship often, indeed, became rather too close for comfort, with certain festivals coming to increasingly resemble vast, compliant ‘showcases’ for upcoming arthouse product. (p. 105)

The competition between arthouse cinemas and film festivals is similarly noted by Peranson (2009) who identifies festivals as having “a number of advantages over regular arthouse screenings in that festivals are *events*” (p. 24, italics in original). It is important to

note that such competition is driven largely by geography and that it is still common for prints to be shared between those film festivals and arthouse cinemas that do not have an overlapping target audience; investigation into the online film programming forums with regard to the communication and proposed joint efforts to secure and share rare or expensive prints provides ample evidence of this.

The sharing of resources is common between film festivals, too. Olaf Möller (2009) describes how the Slovenian-based *Kino Otok* (Cinema Island) is “part of an informal association of similarly interested and sized international film festivals with which they sometimes share prints and travel expenses, occasionally develop programming ideas, etc.” (p. 145). Such co-operation serves a dual purpose: first, it enables film festival organisers to keep the operational costs associated with print transportation low – an aspect identified by Hope (2005) in her discussion of the early development and alliances between the Melbourne International and Sydney Film Festivals; secondly, partnerships promote an ‘efficiency of business’ that is likely to encourage participation. As Iordanova (2009) notes, co-operation between film festival organisers motivates resource providers such as distributors and sales agents as it proves an efficient method of moving a product such as a film through the “supply chain” (p. 26).

The majority of resource-based co-operation between film festivals also occurs when the two events occupy geographically different areas. Thus, the San Francisco International Asian American Film Festival is able to share programming with its “sister festivals” in cities such as San Diego, Seattle, Chicago, Los Angeles, Minneapolis, New York and Washington D.C. (Gore, 2001, p. 321). There are, however, instances in which film festivals that share the same geographic region are able to work together. Gamson (1996) discusses one such co-operative endeavour occurring between two lesbian and gay film festivals in New York: the *New York Lesbian and Gay Film Festival* and *The New York Lesbian and Gay Experimental Film Festival*. These two festivals are able to collaborate due to the diversity and extent of the lesbian and gay audiences within the city, or, as Gamson explains, “New York is one of the few places where a gay and lesbian audience can be divided” (p. 244). This situation works to the advantage of both events as the organisers are able to set up a “division of labour” which includes open discussions about programming and collaboration that “not only reduces conflict between the festivals, it also allows each festival to go about its own business without tremendous internal

conflict” (p. 244). Such a situation is highly unlikely if two film festivals are competing for the same resources.

The importation-based benefits that result from co-operative alliances enable film festival organisers to have access to more potential resources than if they operated alone. For example, Yu Shan Huang (2003) explains how the Taiwan-based *Women’s Film Festival* is able to reach a broader audience through the co-operation of community groups like the “Women’s Right [*sic*] Promotion Association, Public Television, the Alliance of Community Mother, and the Women Rescue and Support Association” (p. 157). Similarly, Raymond J. Haberski (2001) notes that organisers of the New York Film Festival identified the benefits of “joining forces” with the city’s largest film society as a means of increasing the likelihood of a “large popular turnout” (p. 155).

Co-operation also enables a film festival to come to be seen as ‘an event’, thus allowing for more opportunities for participation than would ordinarily be available. At the second edition of the British-based *Royal Anthropological Institute’s International Festival of Ethnographic Film*, for example, a book was published discussing the results of a conference held in conjunction with the film festival (Crawford & Turton, 1992). Similarly, Beauchamp and Behar (1992) make special note of a fashion show held during at the 1947 Cannes Film Festival in which the first “Miss Festival” was crowned (p. 165). The auxiliary nature of these events is useful in attracting additional participants who might otherwise forego involvement. This additional participation is especially useful when motivating sponsors who may not have an immediate connection with film, but who are interested in what the film festival represents because of the co-operation of another organisation. So, the American-based *Small Pictures International Film Festival* annually selects a charity to which the proceeds from the festival will be donated. (Gore, 2001, p. 328).

Strategy two: date placement

Date placement refers to the operational positioning of a film festival at a specified time during the calendar year in order to overcome financial and operations-driven entropy. This calendar positioning is considered strategic because film festival organisers are able to take advantage of occurrences such as distributor release patterns, e.g., the international release schedules of Hollywood films (Beauchamp & Behar, 1992), and of cyclical funding opportunities. SECOR Consulting (2004) acknowledges that the “choice of dates is so

important that some festivals and markets change theirs in an attempt to increase attendance or to enhance their positioning vis-à-vis the competition” (p. 19). Thus, date placement can be seen to represent a key consideration when film festival organisers are assessing the most opportune conditions under which to conduct film festival operation.

This strategy was first developed, consciously or not, by the organisers of the Venice International Film Festival in 1932. De Valck (2007) explains that the “first film festival was organized on New Year’s Day 1898 in Monaco”, however it wasn’t until Venice that a film festival was to be “organized on a regular basis” (p. 47). The ‘regular’ operation of Venice was the result of its affiliation with a long-running, annual and overarching event, the Venice Arts Biennale, to which the film festival was originally attached as a means of extending the tourist season (p. 76).

Date placement promotes the importation of resources by allowing film festival organisers to structure events around any potential opportunities for increased levels of resource provider interaction. For example the American-based *Cine Acción Cine Latino* is held during Hispanic Heritage Month (Gore, 2001, p. 267). Positioning the film festival at this time enables the organisers to form co-operative alliances with ethnic community members and organisations which are more likely to be proactive in their involvement due to an overall raised level of awareness.

The dates of film festival operation can also provide film festivals with greater programming opportunities. For example, Dimitris Kerkinos (2009) identifies the Greek-based *Thessaloniki International Film Festival* as having an “advantage” over other film festivals in the region because its end-of-the-year position allows organisers to program a “more complete picture of the annual Balkan production” (p. 175). Similarly, the *Tokyo International Film Festival* changed its dates of operation from September to November because this new position enabled the film festival to “get more films that would be in theaters for the end-of-the-year holiday season” (Herskovitz, 1998, p. 166).

Date placement also serves an important function in terms of communicating the ‘territory’ occupied by particular events and should there be any ‘trespassing’ by a rival film festival there is likely to be conflict. For example, Peter Biskind (2004) explains how the scheduling of the American-based *Slamdance Film Festival* to coincide with Sundance was not “graciously” accepted by Sundance organisers who ultimately compared Slamdance to a “parasite” (p. 229). This description is appropriate given the rival event’s

physical presence was observed to draw potential resources such as audience members and media attention away from Sundance. Janet Harbord (2009) discusses this the temporal aspect of film festival operation in greater detail noting the influence a “limited schedule of screenings and ticket sales, the last-minute release of the full programme, and the connected events surrounding the screenings”, all have upon the various participants (p. 41).

From an OSM perspective the designation of a date of operation clearly communicates to resource providers when the film festival will be seeking more and different resources. So, a call for entries is conducted in the months leading to operation, thus allowing time for film festival organisers to program and plan event logistics.

The time of operation is similarly important to the influx of participation-based resources – audience members, media, filmmakers – and it is interesting to note that *Variety* is particular about stating either the date or duration of a film festival in nearly all its festival reports. Thus, for example, Ian Mohr (2005) reports on the Film Society of Lincoln Centre-supported niche film festival *Rendez-Vous With French Cinema* as “running March 11-20” (para. 1). This identification of dates serves to alert potential attendees who are unfamiliar with the event as to when the film festival will be held.

Additionally, the designation of a specific time provides participants with a necessary point of reference as to when the re-energisation of new resources must be completed should they wish to interact. For example, Michael Fox (in Tanner, 2009) explains how filmmakers will “target” the particular date of a film festival and plan their production schedule, “[t]hey think, ‘If we start now, can we get this ready for Sundance? If we miss Sundance, will we have it ready for Berlin?’” (p. 148).

The impact of a scheduled film festival also enables participants such as Hollywood distributors to prepare for, and ultimately benefit more from, the event because they can incorporate the event into their business structures. Beauchamp and Behar (1992) explain how a screening at Cannes factors into the publicity of a film’s commercial release schedule:

The primary reason to be in Cannes centers on publicity, the final decision to go revolves around the film’s release date. There are three categories: a movie that has had a full run in the States, one premiered internationally before or after the U.S. release, and one with the release date still several months away. (p. 223)

The fact that a film festival's date can influence the motivation of certain highly sought after resource providers promotes the idea that there are certain inherent positions which allow film festivals better access to resources. According to Robert Koehler (2009), only Cannes, Toronto, Venice and Berlin are “ever able to generally secure the films they actually want” (p. 82). A similar statement is made by Simon Field (in Quandt, 2009) who explains that “Venice, Berlin, Cannes can scoop up the best films and the Montréal, San Sébastian and Karlovy Vary festivals get the scraps and leftovers” (p. 70).

Beauchamp and Behar (1992) note the positioning of Cannes in the Northern Hemisphere autumn is “seen as increasing the odds of drawing American and studio-produced films” (p. 365). This ‘increasing the odds’ of securing a particular type of programming is primarily the result of the scheduled release dates chosen by distributors: “The ‘Bible of Release Dates’ still dictated that summer was a horrible time to release a low-budget or ‘thoughtful’ film. That time was set aside for hardware blockbusters” (p. 365).

Given that there are patterns of resource availability in which film festivals organisers establish their operational structure, it is highly likely that conflict will arise between film festival organisers who feel their ‘territory’ on the calendar has been encroached upon by potential rivals. Kerkinos (2009) explains that “with such a proliferation it’s inevitable that the competition between festivals has increased dramatically, especially between those which share similar profiles” (p. 168). Such a situation took place in 2003 when the Montréal World Film Festival moved its operational date back five days, thus overlapping with both the Venice and Toronto festivals (Poirier, 2003). This move resulted in Montréal losing its FIAPF accreditation and accusations of a sentiment of “ill will” between Montréal’s Serge Losique and Venice’s Moritz de Hadeln (Gaydos, 2005). That this ‘ill will’ was at least in some part rooted in the perceived trespassing of Montréal and the threat it posed to the resource importation of Venice seems obvious. One of the stipulations of FIAPF accreditation is a non-conflicting date of operation, hence when Montréal moved its dates it violated this rule resulting in its loss of ‘A-list’ status (Poirier, 2003). Yet such a threat only arises if the film festivals share similar resource providers. Mark Cousin (2009) explains that such territorial “cat fights” (p. 156) among film festivals are common when public money is given to one film festival and not to another.

FIAPF (2009) only has governance over forty-nine (para. 1) of the hundreds of film festivals organised annually¹⁴ and many non-FIAPF film festivals are understood to be ‘important’ – e.g., Telluride, Tribeca, Pusan, Vancouver and Sundance. So, regardless of the existence of rules, it is inevitable that there will be some crossover between festivals of similar size, stature and focus. For example, Todd McCarthy (2004) identifies that Sundance is able to take “advantage of its position as the first major festival of the calendar year” to get “the jump on both Rotterdam and Berlin” (para. 2). However, this ‘jump’ is downplayed by the former festival director of Sundance, Geoffrey Gilmore, who describes the similarity in programming between the three festivals as only overlapping “somewhat” (para. 2) thus, enabling the film festivals to co-operate with little conflict. Emilio Mayorga (2006) notes a similar crossover situation that developed with the introduction of the new Spanish-based *CIM Madrid International Film Festival*. According to Mayorga the recently organised event is “adding another festival to an already crowded European calendar” (para. 1). Yet, it is possible that the addition of such an event will have little impact, as the organisers have already secured the support needed in order to operate from the Madrid Film Commission as well as Madrid’s municipal authorities. Thus, the festival essentially fills a niche in which the organisers must now prove their worth. Should, organisers wish to expand the event, however, and begin competing with other festivals, it will undoubtedly have an impact on the festival calendar.

Additional calendrical conflicts occur with respect to the date placement of film industry events such as the American Film Market. These industry events also have the potential to limit a film festival’s ability to attract resource provider participation and as SECOR Consulting (2004) explains “the most sought-after professionals have an embarrassment of choice and must be increasingly selective” (p. 18). De Valck (2007) describes one such incident in the 2004 repositioning of the Academy Awards from its former late March position to its current late February date which caused a chain reaction where

the British Academy Film and Television Awards for film (the BAFTA’s) were pushed forward a week to 15 February. This meant a near frontal collision with the Berlinale award ceremony on 14 February... If the Berlinale, however, could

¹⁴ De Valck (2007) notes that the estimated number of film festival currently operating worldwide each year lies between 1,200 and 1,900 (p. 68)

have moved a couple of days forward, the expected knock-on-effect would have effected [*sic*] the International Film Festival Rotterdam. (p. 134)

The impact of these new dates was significantly less the next year, as the film festivals and their resource providers were able to plan ahead and schedule accordingly. So, date shifts can be seen to have a tendency to only cause operational difficulties for a single cycle of operation, or at least until film festival organisers are able to address and amend the situation.

Selecting a date because it is *seen* as important can be a potentially flawed strategy due to the contrived nature of participation. The most effective means of applying this strategy is to consider where and when the resources required for operation are available. Lauri Tanner (2009) asked Mark Fishkin of any problem he may have had “positioning the new Mill Valley Film Festival under the shadow of a major existing festival like the San Francisco International Film Festival?” (p. 22). Fishkin replied “we were not trying to compete” and insisted there was no potential for threat as Mill Valley focused on a niche programming stream of Northern California Filmmakers only” (p. 22).

Strategy three: geographic location

The geographic location of a film festival is widely used as a means for motivating participation, especially from those resource providers who are required to physically attend the event, such as audience members, filmmakers, media, etc. De Valck (2007) discusses the planning that often occurs when deciding upon a film festival’s geographical base:

The physical location of the festival is very important for the festival’s image of cultural difference and it is used in festival marketing strategies to compete with other film festivals. Location, the element most central to a festival’s image, is usually reflected in the name. By and large, festivals are named after the city where they take place. (p. 137)

Fishkin (in Tanner, 2009) makes a similar observation, suggesting that a connection exists between the uses of locations in the titling of film festival:

Sometimes and even still today, when people are not aware of you, they automatically might think a festival in an urban area (which has) the name of a city means it’s more important than a small town [festival]. But we know that’s not really true. (p. 26)

For the most part, the strategy requires the film festival to be located in an area that is attractive or important in and of itself. For example, Jack Valenti, long-time president of the Motion Pictures Association of America, explains (in Beauchamp & Behar, 1992) that there

is no question that part of the allure of Cannes is its location. If you started from scratch and said, “Where can we begin a festival that would attract an international audience year after year?” ... I’d be hard pressed to tell you a better place. (p. 41)

A similar physical allure can be associated with the *San Sebastian International Film Festival*, held in what is described as “perhaps Spain’s most beautiful town, with the country’s highest standard of living, certainly its finest food” (Holland & Hopewell, 2006, para. 1). The motivation to attend is greatly increased among those potential participants eager to experience activities beyond those offered by the festival.

The organisers of the Venice International Film Festival were once again most likely the first to implement this strategy. As de Valck (2007) explains:

One of the motivations for the establishment of the first reoccurring film festival in Venice in 1932 was tourism. The festival was carefully designed at attracting as many visitors as possible to the city at a time when the tourist season was just coming to an end. (p. 76)

The economic benefits of the event upon the community were instantaneous. Rhyne (2009) reports that the addition of the film festival to Venice’s tourist season resulted in an increase of more than 25,000 people its first year (p. 11). The tourism opportunities that film festivals bring to their communities has been well-documented. Derek Elley (1998) explains that the organisation that set up Italian-based *Locarno International Film Festival* started the festival “just after World War II with tourism, not just film culture on its mind” (p. 113). Similarly, Beauchamp and Behar (1992) note that the “Cannes International Film Festival was heralded not only as a major film event, but as a general announcement to the world at large that the Riviera was again welcoming tourists” (p. 44) after the end of World War II.

The use of a film festival for the purpose of promotion is termed by de Valck (2007) as “City Marketing”, and she explains that it has become “a key concept in describing the worldwide municipal strategies for the promotion of their [the resident film festival’s]

cities since the 1980s” (p. 75). It is important to note that a certain level of community acceptance and participation is required from the population where a film festival is situated. According to Macdonald (1998), it is the “infusion of cash that an off-season event can provide” that motivates resort-style communities to host film festivals (p. 39). This motivation is required due to the amount of community involvement necessary for most film festivals. Turan (2003) notes that the off-season population of Park City increases by over 20,000 people during Sundance (p. 32). Such a volume of people attending the festival requires co-ordination and communication between the festival organisers and those community members and services most likely to be influenced, e.g., hotels, public transport, police, hospitals, etc.

For those film festivals not located in a resort or ‘known’ vacation spot, the geographic location of the event may still be used to the advantage of the film festival organisers. The placement of the *Tribeca Film Festival* in one of world’s largest cities (New York City’s population is estimated at just over 8 million) means organisers are able to facilitate “a family festival that runs concurrently with the festival” (Amdur & Rooney, 2004, para. 18). The advantage of holding a film festival in a location with such a large population enables the organisers to diversify their programming so as to include a wider demographic without compromising attendance of the core event.

Similarly, the physical location of an event may enable film festival organisers to have greater opportunity to access highly sought after resources. Stephen Teo (2009) identifies the Pusan International, the Hong Kong International and the *Singapore International* as the “three most important festivals in Asia because of their locations – all strategic hubs on the East Asian mainland stretching from the northeast to southeast – and because of their stated aim of promoting Asian cinema” (p. 119).

Additionally, Sheila Benson (1998) explains how the close proximity of the Mill Valley Film Festival to director George Lucas’ Industrial Light & Magic studios, as well as to American Zoetrope (a.k.a Zeetrope Studios) provided the organisers with “access to the cache of technical talents who preferred the hills of Marin County to the hills of Hollywood” (p. 149). A similar reference to proximity is made by the organisers of the American-based *Brainwash Movie Festival*, who cite the fact that “Robin Williams lives in Sea Cliff... [and that] Showtime acquisitions attend our festival” (Gore, 2001, p. 263) as incentives for participation.

The geographic position of a film festival can also promote a monopolistic type of control over participation. That is, if a film festival's location is physically or culturally isolated it may represent the only type of interaction of its kind. Thus, resource providers have no other options but to participate with the only organisation available. Gary Meyer (in Tanner, 2009) comments on the success of the Palm Springs International Film Festival by saying that the local community is “totally underserved in Palm Springs. There are no art houses there, and none of the theatres show anything but the very biggest of art films, and usually quite late” (p. 76). By contrast, Simon Field (in Quandt, 2009) explains “Paris would be an impossible place to have a festival, because there are films everywhere already... festivals should be in anonymous cities with few distractions” (p. 71). This situation is confirmed by de Valck (2007) who claims that this was one of the reasons why Paris was not chosen for the original location of the Cannes International Film Festival:

If it had been located in Paris it would have had a much harder time of distinguishing itself from ample supply of other cultural activities in Paris. In short, the location on the Riviera contributed to its exclusivity and appeal. (p. 115)

Similarly, some film festivals only accept entries from local suppliers, such as the American-based *Northwest Film & Video Festival* which limits its programming to films produced by “artists residing in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, Alaska and British Colombia” (Gore, 2001, p. 311). The strategy of restricting from where certain resources originate may serve to elevate the film festival's stature as it grows to represent the ‘authority’ of that particular type of cinema in that geographic location.

There are instances in which the geographic location of a film festival actually works to the detriment of the festival. In 2006 organisers of the Pusan International Film Festival were expecting lower numbers of attendees due to a recent bomb test in North Korea (Frater, 2006). The challenges associated with geographical positioning however are often circumstantial, e.g., if North Korea were to be viewed as less of a ‘danger zone’ the challenges arising from Pusan's geographical location would decrease proportionally.

Strategy four: identifiable function

The strategy of being perceived as fulfilling an identifiable function consists of providing recognition of the purpose or intent of a film festival through an overt means – a mission statement, expressed goals or objectives, etc. – so as to clearly communicate the event's capacity for operation. For example, the American-based *Human Rights Watch International Film Festival* identifies itself as a “showcase for films related to human

rights subject matter [in the form of] documentary, fiction and animation of any length” (Gaydos, 1998, p. 97). Such a description gives the film festival a *raison d’être* and a recognisable form. In the previous chapter, it was explained that social systems do not have an ‘anatomy’ but rather are understood as “events or happenings” (Katz & Kahn, 1978, p. 36) and that through the use of paradigms participants are able to construct “a model, pattern, or a set of rules that define boundaries” (Harris & Nelson, 2008, p. 38). The identified function of a film festival can be seen to effectively communicate such a paradigm, thus, enabling film festival organisers to frame a participant’s understanding of the boundaries of the event prior to interaction. Observable examples of identifiable functions include: the French-based *Festival du Court Metrage en Plein Air de Grenoble* describing its programming as including “new and old talents, with both indoor and open-air screenings” (Gaydos, 1998, p. 106); the Internet-based *Charged 60-second Film Festival* whose competition is “dedicated to films and videos of one minute or less” (Gore, 2001, p. 264); and the American-based *Tech TV’s Cam Film Festival*, which is “designed to teach people how to use their new digital cameras and home editing equipment” (p. 331).

An identifiable function serves to dispel any potential ambiguity as to the exact role of the event and enables potential participants to draw their own conclusions regarding the specific benefits of interaction they may receive. This aspect of resource provider self-assessment is important given the exposure and publicity film festivals generally receive and enables film festival organisers to take advantage of potential participants who may reside outside of the area of focus. So, the American-based *Cucalorus Film Festival* states that its goal is “to bring independent film culture and awareness to Wilmington [North Carolina]. We strive to display deserving work, creating a noncompetitive showcase of films spawned from all budgets, by filmmakers of all backgrounds” (Gore, 2001, p. 270). This overt statement by the festival organisers not only identifies the function of the film festival but also addresses what type of filmmakers should consider participating, thus enabling to the organisers to raise awareness of the event without having contact with resource providers.

The strategy of an identifiable function can be seen to have arisen from the legalities involved in operating a formal organisation. Milofsky (1988) explains that formal organisations are “social systems that are legally constituted to achieve goals” (p. 10). He explains that many organisations often do not achieve their goals, but that through the process of goal setting they are able to structure “explicit membership boundaries,

articulating a decision-making structure and hierarchy of power, and defining the participants' activities" (p. 10).

Such construction of 'membership boundaries' and 'defining of participants' activities' help to encourage participation because they frame the parameters of interaction and provide a basis for understanding what involvement may entail. Fishkin (in Tanner, 2009) explains how the organisers of the Mill Valley Film Festival were able to structure interaction around the phrase "a celebration of the art of film" (p. 26). He notes how organisers "intentionally wanted an atmosphere that was *not* competitive, that people could come here and celebrate" (p. 26, emphasis in original). The purpose of creating a specific 'atmosphere' is strategic in that it directly appeals to the expectations of the participants. That is, participants who have never attended a film festival before may attend an event expecting it to operate in a similar capacity as a commercial theatre screening, thus holding the event to an incorrect frame of reference and potentially jeopardising their future interaction. The use of the terms 'celebration' and 'art of film' serve as signposts to the nature of the event, and thus hopefully condition any preconceived notions of the film festival potential participants may have. Even if potential participants do not fully understand what the terms mean, the strategy of employing an identifiable function can alter their expectations enough to promote an open frame of mind. Gail Silva (in Tanner, 2009) comments of a festival she organised:

We just wanted to keep the word 'independent' visible within all the stuff we did, but we knew that most people didn't know what the words 'independent film and video' meant, didn't understand its context...we knew what we had to sell were the *ideas* of the pieces. (p. 70, emphasis in original)

An identifiable function can also serve as a 'rallying point' for specific interest groups. For example, the American-based *Hi Mom! Film Festival* describes itself as "a festival for filmmakers with big ideas and little bank accounts" (Gore, 2001, p. 284). Similarly, Slamdance's catchcall "for filmmakers, by filmmakers" is an overt display of the film festival's ideological alignment. Acknowledging that a festival has a preference for a particular type of participant enables organisers to effectively remove any ambiguity as to who should participate in the film festival. For example, organisers of the American-based *Dances with Films* announce that films submitted into the film festival "have no known directors, actors or producers" (Gore, 2001, p. 271). This type of boundary setting is an important aspect in terms of saving time: organisers can avoid time and energy

consuming interactions with resource providers who do not fit the ideological frame of the festival, and thus prevent the ‘wrong’ participants from attending.

Fox (in Tanner, 2009) explains that from a film critic’s point of view, the first aspect festival organisers need to convey is the “purpose or the mission of the festival” (p. 146). This is done so that the critic, as a journalist, is able to first identify a ‘story’, and then to decide if the festival is worth attending. By discouraging those ‘unsuitable’ participants from interacting, film festival organisers avoid unnecessary scrutiny of the event that could result in future non-participation of particular resource providers due to previous bad experiences. A foreseeable danger of this technique is the alienation of the festival due to its extremely niche appeal. So, as Alexander (1997) explains, the Canadian-based *World’s Worst Movies Festival* was unable to “sustain the interest” of members of the Ottawa community because of the limited appeal of its programming over time (para. 4). Organisers of events such as the American-based *Freaky Film Festival* whose “annual mission [is] to provide our audience with diverse and unpredictable programs” (Gore, 2001, p. 280) may encounter a similar lack of support due to limited interest should those programs become *too* diverse or unpredictable.

Film festival organisers are also likely to encounter non-participation if they fail to deliver, or do not operate according to, their identified function. This aspect is indicative of the legitimacy of the event’s operation. Hope (2004) comments on one such legitimacy problem encountered during the early operation of the Sydney and Melbourne International Film Festivals. She explains how the festivals nearly compromised their “cultural legitimacy” as “exhibitors of non-mainstream quality cinema” (p. 1) because the programming of certain films gave the events the appearance of being “promotional devices for the commercial trade” (p. 196).

Sambolgo Bangré (1996) notes how many film festivals promote the same objectives, namely, “to distribute and promote films: to enable film-makers, critics, the public and producers to meet; to offer an opportunity to get to know the realities of different film-makers and of their counties” and points out that these “noble objectives” may mask other “ambitions” (p. 158).

Perhaps the most well-known example of ulterior motivations is the use of the Venice International Film Festival by Mussolini’s government to promote political ideas indicative of Fascist politics (Rooney, 1998). Stone (2002) relates how at “its 1932

inauguration, the film festival made a splash, [by] projecting forty films from nine nations” (p. 294), but that the ‘ambitions’ of the festival’s Fascist organisers soon became observable. By 1935 the “political overtones were clear” and skepticism as to the validity of the original goal of the festival as “recognizing filmmaking as art” became palpable (Beauchamp & Behar, 1992, p. 43) due to the obvious bias in the selection of films for awards: films from Nazi Germany won the Best Foreign Film awards in 1937 and 1938 (Stone, 2002, p. 296). The perceived illegitimacy of the event led to a split between the Axis and Allied nations, with the result being the formation of the Cannes International Film Festival in 1939. In 1940 the official title of the Venice festival was changed to underline that political allegiance which had been so obvious to many: it became the *Manifestazione Cinematografica Italio-Germanica* – the Italian German Film Festival (p. 296). The transition from “recognizing filmmaking as art” to propaganda machine for German and Italian fascist aims is a recognisable result of the make-up festival’s primary resource providers. That is, since the Fascist government was the underwriter of the film festival, it became inevitable that it would reflect such an ideology. De Valck (2007) examines a similar situation with the strategic placement of Berlin International Film Festival as “an American instrument of the Cold War” (p. 52).

Strategy five: legitimising affiliations

A legitimising affiliation consists of a partnership or connection between a film festival and another organisation, business or individual which gives the film festival a level of credibility that in turn influences the motivation of other potential participants. Such an affiliation may be internal, as when the founder of the film festival is a recognisable figure, such as in the case of Robert De Niro and the Tribeca Film Festival¹⁵, or it may be external in that it derives from interaction such as corporate sponsorship of an event.

This strategy is based upon the concept that participation validates operation, and differs from the strategy of co-operative alliances in that each affiliation is focused on enhancing the *image* of the film festival and not necessarily of contributing physical resources to the actual operation of the event. That is, through participation film festival organisers are able to prove to potential resource providers that their event is a viable open system; a system that is displaying negative entropy. The strategy of legitimising

¹⁵ The connection between De Niro and Tribeca is so strong that the film festival has been referred to as “Robert De Niro’s Film Festival” (Softpedia, 2006).

affiliations then frames this participation so as to portray the festival as having an inherent organisational legitimacy due to its interaction with ‘worthy’ and ‘important’ participants. For example, Claude Jarman (in Tanner, 2009) describes how support from the Mayor of San Francisco gave the organisers of the San Francisco International Film Festival a “stamp of authenticity” (p. 108).

A similar ‘stamp of authenticity’ is acknowledged by Biskind (2004) who describes how organisers of Sundance “clung” to director Steven Soderbergh following the success of his film *sex, lies, and videotape* (1989), using him as a “poster boy for the festival” (p. 83). The connection between Sundance and Soderbergh can be seen to manipulate potential participants because a link can be drawn between the success of Soderbergh and his interaction or affiliation with the event. The *New York Expo of Short Film and Video* is another film festival that explicitly uses this strategy, claiming its event as one “of the first festivals to recognize the talents of Spike Lee, George Lucas and Martha Coolidge” (Gore, 2001, p. 308).

Another example of how film festival organisers may use their participatory connectivity to encourage participation is identified by Hope (2004), who explains how “links” between the early Australian film festivals and Australian distributors were used to “encourage overseas distributors to give the Festivals more and better films” (p. 75). This ‘encouragement’ stemmed from the belief that the affiliations between the Australian distributors and the festivals would lead to a greater probability of international films receiving distribution in their territory.

The use of ‘stamps of approval’, ‘poster boys’ and of film industry connections, serves ultimately to raise the perceived value of the event, and therefore affords the organisers a great opportunity when it comes to motivating potential participants. Paul DiMaggio and Walter Powell (1988) discuss aspects of organisational prestige when examining institutional isomorphism and the collective rationality found in organisational fields. According to these theorists a “status competition” exists within certain organisational fields that then results in a general pattern in which “[o]rganizational prestige and resources are key elements in attracting professionals” (p. 87). Such ‘status competition’ can be readily observed in the milieu of film festivals which Robert Koehler (2009) describes as a “never-ending race between festivals to score points” (p. 81).

The basis of the legitimising affiliation strategy is also congruent with the findings of organisational theorists Joseph Galaskiewicz and Barbara Rauschenbach (1988) who explain that it is common for a cultural organisation to be seen as “striving to enhance its prestige through association with more influential corporations” (p. 132). This study comprehends the ‘enhancement of prestige’ to include the fostering by film festivals of the patronage of individuals such as well-known and respected directors, critics, actors, artists, etc., whose participation is often seen as ‘headlining’ events. For example, Harris (2004a) spruiks in her *Variety Online* article, subtitled ‘Talent flock to latest edition of SXSW fest’, that the number of celebrities, or “celebs who braved the weather included Crispin Glover, Christina Ricci, Adam Goldberg and Janine Turner” (para. 10). Similarly, Beauchamp and Behar (1992) note that at the 1949 Cannes Film Festival “Errol Flynn, Rita Hayworth, Tyrone Power, Yves Montand and Pablo Picasso began the tradition of walking up the red-carpeted Palais steps” (p. 131).

Marshalling the “glamour and fantasy of Hollywood” (Stone, 2002, p. 295) has been used as a method of displaying a film festival’s legitimacy since the inaugural Venice International Film Festival. Yet, the strategy of employing legitimising affiliations does not require that a film festival *actually* attain the participation of the most valued individuals or organisations. Rather, as discussed by Galaskiewicz and Rauschenbach (1988), it is sometimes enough for the cultural organisation to “receive corporate support – it is not necessary to link up with the more influential corporations in town” (p. 133). Thus, film festival organisers are able to utilise any contacts and partnerships they deem capable of raising the organisational legitimacy in their event. Tanner (2009) endorses this view by stressing the importance of evaluating and promoting the “current and potential Endorsers/Supporters/Sponsors, including individuals, organizations and businesses; plus information on any collaborative relationships that might currently exist with other groups or companies which would potentially relate to this project [film festival]” (p. 168).

The use of affiliates is categorised by this study into five distinct groups: organisers, organisations, patrons/official guests, board of directors and sponsors. The purpose of this categorisation is to delineate the unique importation-based advantages each group presents to film festival organisers. It is possible for film festival organisers to utilise any number of groups and combination of groups when employing this strategy, and no one group presents itself as the best possible option under all conditions.

Organiser-based affiliation

Organisers are those individuals who are internal to the film festival organisation, be they a programmer, a program manager or a festival director. These individuals are seen to contribute to the overall prestige of the event through their reputation among and relationships with the resource providers; individual's whose primacy to the contemporary culture of film festivals is so great that de Valck (2007) suitably identifies the contemporary scene as "The Age of Festival Directors" (p. 191). For example, Brian Johnson (2000) explains how Anne Mackenzie, former co-ordinator of the Canadian-based *Women and Film International Festival* was hired as the first program manager of the Toronto International Film Festival because she had had experience facilitating a film festival previously in Toronto, and could utilise her contacts to help establish a reputation for her new employer more quickly than if the event organisers had hired an individual with no known qualities (p. 12). Obviously Mackenzie's involvement could be viewed as a strategic advantage for the Toronto International Film Festival.

An organiser is able to strategically contribute to the importation of resources when they are able to effectively manipulate the interpersonal nature of their work. In a manner similar to an individual who is successful in the corporate world, successful film festival organisers possess a particular skill set that enables them to be effective when interacting with resource providers. For example, Ebert (in Johnson, 2000) describes how Murray 'Dusty' Cohl, co-founder of the Toronto International Film Festival, "seemed to have a gift for meeting all the journalists" while attending Cannes to promote the inauguration of his own event later that year (p. 24). Hope (2004) comments on the effectiveness of both Erwin Rado, festival director of the Melbourne International Film Festival from 1954 to 1979 (p. 64), and David Stratton, festival director of the Sydney Film Festival from 1966 to 1983 (p. 141), when the two conducted their individual visits to international distributors.

Gilmore (in Tanner, 2009) puts the lie to the common misconception that "for the most part film festivals are thought of as things that anybody can do, all you need to know is a little bit about movies" by advocating that the selection of a film festival organiser be seen as on a par with the selection of the co-ordinator of "an arts organization, a museum, or a symphony" (p. 136).

The relationships that form between film festival organisers and various resource providers have been seen to give some film festivals an advantage with regard to resource

importation. For example, Peranson (2009) notes that the international sales director of the French-based Wild Bunch is in contact with the organisers of both Cannes and Venice all year round (p. 32). That the current festival director of Cannes, Thierry Fremaux, previously worked as Cannes' artistic director (Elley & Hopewell, 2007), and that Marco Müller served as the festival director of the Locarno, Rotterdam and Pesaro before being hired by Venice in 2004 (Vivarelli, 2004; De La Fuente, 2004) can be no mere coincidence.

It is interesting to note that when Müller took his position at Venice he soon after hired Elenora Granata to be the event's representative in the United States, citing her "rare combination of experience and exuberance *that the festival will fully benefit from*. Her impressive industry relationship along with her artistic sensibility fit perfectly with our *vision of the festival's future*" (De La Fuente, 2003, para. 5, emphasis added). And so, naturally, when an organiser leaves a film festival the effects can be detrimental to operation. For example, Steven Gaydos (1998) explains that it "took [Palm Springs International Film Festival] several years to recover" when its director Darryl Macdonald resigned (p. 47).

The organisers of the Swiss-based *Zurich Film Festival* are noted to include a program manager who is a "popular character actor in films and television", and a marketing manager who is a "well-known model" (Grey, 2006, para 3); the German-based *Hof International Film Festival* is noted to be directed "by one of the most respected German film enthusiasts, Heinz Badewits" (Cowie, 2003, p. 374); the Spanish-based *Tudela First Film Festival* is touted as being "run by popular journalist Luis Alegre" (p. 419); and the prestige of the American-based *Roger Ebert's Overlooked Film Festival* (Ebertfest) (Gore, 2001, p. 319), which is programmed and hosted by the prominent film critic himself is similarly elevated.

It is important to note that not all organiser-based affiliations are beneficial to film festival operation, which provides further testament to the importance of such affiliations. Kong Rithdee (2009) explains how the Thai government contracted the Los Angeles-based company, Film Festival Management Inc., to facilitate the Bangkok International Film Festival from 2003 to 2006. The owners of Film Festival Management were hired to create a certain level of "glitz and glamour" through their access to celebrities and specialisation in "special gala events" (p. 128). According to Rithdee, the American organisers contributed to "one of the most shocking infamies in the history of international film

festivals” (p. 122) in that they had “little experience in managing a film festival” (p. 124) and ultimately ended up spending 100 times more than had been originally budgeted (p. 128). To further sour the situation the owners of Film Festival Management were later found guilty of bribing a high ranking official in the Thai government (p. 122).

Another problematic situation is identified by Teo (2009) who explains that the “same people who ran SIFF [Singapore International Film Festival] at its inception twenty years ago are still running it today – a sign that the organisation is sorely in need of generational change” (p. 117). This is effectively a paraphrasing of the current study’s contention that affiliations affect the perception of negative entropy which film festivals wish to portray.

Gamson (1996) explains how a similar lack of turnover was beginning to influence the performance level of the *Experimental Festival* in New York. Co-founder of the festival Sarah Schulman, explains that because she and her colleagues “didn’t go to fancy school... [i]n many ways it hurt the festival because we didn’t have the connections, we didn’t know all the fancy people” (p. 250). The organisers decided to “pass the torch” to two younger, ethnic filmmakers “whose work the founders admired” (p. 249), and whose educational backgrounds included study at Harvard University and New York University’s Studio Art and Cinema Studies Program (p. 250). Gamson identifies two advantages to this organisational turnover using terminology which serves to reinforce the identification of film festivals as open systems whose existence is predicated on the successful importation of resources to promote negative entropy:

First, it furnished the festival with new human resources, while promising to transform it into an organization more directly connected to and more adequately serving communities of color. Second, it provided the festival with new potential survival resources, not in the form of direct economic support (like most cultural workers...) but in the form of increased cultural and social capital. (p. 250)

Organisation-based affiliation

Organisation-based affiliation refers to those film festivals that originate from an already existing entity such as a film society or arts festival. The American-based *South by Southwest* (a.k.a. SXSW Film) was formed as part of an already operating, highly successful event, presenting a Music and Media Conference which began in 1987 (SXSW, 2009, para. 1). The film festival was officially added in 1994 (Gore, 2001, p. 228).

Additional examples of film festivals that began through pre-existing organisations include: the Venice International Film Festival (Stone, 2002; de Valck, 2007; Beauchamp & Behar, 1992), the London Film Festival (Gaydos, 1998, p. 168), *Cinema/Chicago* (Gore, 2001, p. 240) and the *Freedom Film Festival* (p. 289).

There are several importation-based advantages to having a film festival originate from an already functional event. First, the host organisation offers the film festival the legitimising presence of a proven operational infrastructure. Film festival organisers are likely to benefit from secured resource channels that have already been developed by the presenting organisation. For example, Rahul Hamid (2009) explains how the Film Society of the Lincoln Center, through a New Projects Fund, completely underwrote the New York Film Festival for its first years of operation (p. 72). This secured source of funding then enabled film festival organisers to devote undivided attention to more central aspects of the event such as programming and audience building. Without this advantage it is likely that the New York Film Festival organisers would have experienced what former Sundance director Geoffrey Gilmore (in Tanner, 2009) considers the “steal from Peter to pay Paul” situation that affects most film festivals (p. 135) at some time.

This situation sees film festival organisers continually devising means to develop new funding streams, e.g., fundraising events such as preview screenings, so as to establish an economic-base. However, through this activity the film festival organiser will often neglect to reinvest in the film festival itself thus “film festivals end up having to scratch and survive in a (bare bones) budget operation” (p. 135, parentheses in original).

Such a situation diminishes the capabilities of the film festival organisers to develop the film festival to its full potential because there are always areas of operation that are continually tending towards entropy through resource depletion. Organisation-based affiliations often protect film festivals from the forces of entropy that would otherwise halt the operation of an individually functioning event. The Vancouver International Film Festival, for example, is organised under the Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society (SECOR, 2004, p. 24). As part of this larger society, festival organisers are able to access to the Vancouver International Film Centre which contains “state-of-the-art projection and sound equipment” for festival screenings (VIFC, 2008, para. 4) thus reducing the operations and financially-driven entropy that occurs through operation.

Similarly, a host organisation can provide a film festival with access to an established social network, which could include necessities as diverse as email addresses or an audience base. An example of the latter is once again the Greater Vancouver International Film Festival Society which has 41,000 members (SECOR, 2004, p. 22) and is involved in co-operative alliances with other community organisations. This access enables the festival to implement more comprehensive aspects of interaction, such as film education, as opposed to *just* trying to secure participation. The result of this established social network provides relief from participation-driven entropy and ensures that the festival overcomes attendance problems which can hinder the operation of other independent events.

Patrons/official guests-based affiliation

The affiliation with patrons and official guests provides legitimacy to an event through the very cachet of their positions as people of social or industry importance. Patrons and official guests generally serve this same function, the difference being the transient nature of the latter's participation. Patrons are individuals who are affiliated with a film festival on an ongoing basis, while official guests may change from event to event and generally only remain at the film festival for a short period. So, for example, the typical guest at the Venice International Film Festival only attends the film festival for three days (de Valck, 2007, p. 132).

Both patrons and official guests are understood to be held in esteem for their expressed qualities beyond the environment of the festival itself and while some individuals' vocations may reside in other fields, be they politics, music, sports, etc., the majority of individuals affiliated with film festivals in this manner are from the film industry. As a general rule the more accomplished or important the patron or guest, e.g., an Academy Award winning director, the more valuable the affiliation is to the film festival.

For the most part patrons are not required to be involved the operation of the film festival but serve only in a figurehead role, while official guests may have a more active role in the operation of the event by participating as jury members, hosting masterclasses or introducing films, etc. The importation-based advantage presented by having such individuals affiliated with the festival is twofold.

First, the attendance of a celebrity or respected filmmaker can help to 'rarify' the event. That is, participants such as audience members, reporters and film critics are more

likely to attend an event if it presents a unique experience. According to Fox (in Tanner, 2009),

a film review will rarely be on the front page of an entertainment section, or a Sunday section, but an interview will be. So just having a filmmaker come to the festival means [film festival organisers] have a chance for wider exposure. (p. 146)

Second, the affiliation of known individuals can improve the perceived validity of the film festival and strengthen its identifiable function, thus potentially influencing the motivation for a resource provider to participate. For example, Leonardo DiCaprio is the patron of the American-based *Leofest* which positions itself as a potential platform for aspiring filmmakers. This identifiable function is given additional legitimacy through a personal message from the patron: “I’ve been around artists my entire life. Breaking through – when you are just starting out – can seem impossible... this festival strives to offer a level playing field on which anyone who wishes may play” (in Gore, 2001, pp. 402-403). Similarly, the participation of Catherine Breillat, Ridley Scott and a “host of Oscar winners” at the Berlin Talent Campus in 2005 (Barracough, 2004, para. 1) was intended to provide motivation for aspiring film industry professionals to apply for one of the 500 available spots.

A similar legitimisation is observable in the participation of Steven Spielberg, George Lucas and Francis Ford Coppola at the 2004 French-based *Deauville American Films Festival*. This event is dedicated to “showcasing the American cinematographic diversity [of] Hollywood or independent cinema, and has unstintingly discovered new talents such as actors or directors” (DAFF, 2009, para. 1). The attendance of three of America’s iconic film directors not only validates this function but also “provided a major boost to the financially pinched fest” (James & Nesselson, 2004, para. 6).

Additionally, some film festivals elect to have awards and tributes named after particular individuals of significant stature. For example, de la Fuente (2006) reports on Antonio Banderas receiving “a Gabi Lifetime Achievement award” at the tenth edition of the Los Angeles Latino International Film Festival (para. 1). The ‘Gabi’ is named after the influential Mexican cinematographer Gabriel Figueroa and not only serves to legitimise the film festival through affiliation, but also attracts respected guests, such as Banderas, who are seen to be honoured to receive an award with such a prestigious name attached. A similar technique is employed by, the Macedonian-based *International Film Camera*

Festival “Manaki Brothers”, but instead of presenting an award in an individual’s name the event is “[n]amed after the first Balkan cameraman” (Gaydos, 1998, p. 140). Such a strategy also works as a form of coding, thus attracting those individual who are likely to benefit most from participation.

It is important to note, however, that the attendance of official guests at a film festival is not always to the benefit of the event. Many times celebrities attend a film festival merely as part of a contractual agreement with a film distributor who in turn is using the publicity generated at the event to raise public awareness of the film. Dana Harris and Brendan Kelly (2004) note how an array of “[c]elebrities have obliged their studios’ intentions” by attending the Toronto International Film Festival (para. 6), and Harris (2005) describes how the rapper Ludacris “oblige[d] the letter of the law” in his contract with William Morris Agency spending a total of exactly “90 seconds” promoting the 2005 film *Hustle & Flow* at the Sundance Film Festival’s official post screening party (para. 7).

In cases such as this, where the guest is not procured through personal contacts but rather arranged through business means, the festival can risk greater exposure to unforeseen costs in terms of both social and economic capital due to the guest’s behaviour as when actor Doris Day and her husband were given use of a car courtesy of the French Government during their visit to the Cannes Film Festival and drove the vehicle to Italy (Rupert Allan in Beauchamp & Behar, 1992, p. 170). A similar social and economic faux pas was committed at the Cannes by visiting festival guest Robert Mitchum who took a “bath in champagne”, thus causing a “*crise diplomatique*” when he checked out of the hotel leaving the film festival to cover the cost of his unorthodox bathing habits (p. 170).

Additionally, film festival organisers must be wary of the connotations certain guests bring with them as part of their reputation; attendance may not always produce the desired effect among the other participants. Galaskiewicz and Rauschenbach (1988) explain that “it may only be necessary to reach out into the other sector to win recognition” (p. 133), but such recognition can be used against a film festival. Such was the case of the Palm Springs International Film Festival when it presented Sylvester Stallone with a lifetime achievement award. According to Gaydos (1998) Stallone’s “decidedly mixed body of work created a critical backlash both in and out of the fest infrastructure that threatened to diminish the fest’s very substantial progress over the past decade in planning and programming” (p. 46).

Board of directors-based affiliation

The board of directors is that entity consisting of individuals internal to the film festival structure whose role is generally characterised by their involvement in planning and the offering of advice/guidance to the physical operator, e.g., the film festival director. This understanding is congruent with the description of a festival's organisational structure as presented by SECOR Consulting (2004), which notes the function of Canadian board members as being important in fundraising and supervision, but that in general the members of film festival boards are “not involved in operational or programming decisions, or in event organization, etc. However, any major change of direction of positioning (e.g., change of dates) must be submitted to and ratified by the board” (p. 21). There are, however instances in which the board members of the film festival also act as its physical facilitators. Fishkin (in Tanner, 2009) explains how when the Mill Valley Film Festival first commenced operation it had only three board members and that the operations-based responsibilities were shared between them according to their employment backgrounds (p. 22). In cases such as this the adoption of a dual role can be seen to streamline the operational process. Galaskiewicz and Rauschenbach (1988) explain that the more sources of decisional input there are, “the less influence any one of them is likely to have” (p. 121). Thus film festivals that boast numerous board members, e.g., Toronto (33), Cannes (28) and Sundance (25) (SECOR, 2004, p. 22), may not be able to efficiently respond to dramatic changes in the film festival environment due to bureaucratic delays, e.g., holding a meeting in which a quorum is present, reaching a consensus, etc.

In a manner similar to the hiring of a well-known festival director, the incorporation of reputable board members can also legitimise the operation of an event. As Galaskiewicz and Rauschenbach (1988) note, “cultural organizations may put executives of very influential companies on their board to lead others to believe that they are very prestigious” (p. 120). The recruitment of board members generally includes selecting individuals from the film industry and the business sector, so SECOR Consulting (2004) explains how board members of the Vancouver International Film Festival are “drawn from the local film and business communities and British Columbia public organizations” (p. 25).

The decision to choose board members with specific backgrounds or vocations is a strategy which gives a film festival greater access to a particular resource provider. Ron Henderson (in Tanner, 2009) explains that it is important for film festivals to have

individuals on the board who can “open doors for you [the festival director] in the community” (p. 126). Thus, when Hope (2004) notes that committee members of the Melbourne International Film Festival were “primarily made up of film culture figures” while the Sydney Film Festival “contained many representatives from the film industry” (p. 59), it can be deduced that each board was indicative of the area the individual festival was most likely to call upon for resources. So, changes in the board demographics may be used to analyse the degree to which a film festival has become accepted into its community. That is, a board may transform during the course of operation to reflect the position and legitimacy of the film festival. Claude Jarman (in Tanner, 2009) notes changes both in the type and level of board commitment to the promotion of the San Francisco International Film Festival:

It wasn't a Board like there is today, which is more active. Then [the late 1950s] people came on the Board and brought prestige, guidance, maybe they'd buy a couple of tables for Opening Night or something like that, but never any heavy donors like now. (p. 112)

Additional, importation-based benefits of board members include access to social networks for the purpose of fundraising (SECOR, 2004, p. 23), and, according to founder and director of the American-based *Cinequest San Jose Film Festival* Halfdan Hussey (in Tanner, 2009), providing “cash contacts all of the year” (p. 138). Similarly, most board members ‘understand’ that membership translates to financial or in-kind support of the festival and as Galaskiewicz and Rauschenbach (1988) argue:

[festivals which operate on a] nonprofit [basis] will often indicate to their board members that they are expected to “hit up” their employer for a corporate contribution...because companies should be more responsive to the requests which an employee makes on behalf of a nonprofit than to the request of a stranger. (p. 123)

The strategic use of board member affiliation is not problem-free. In fact, the previously mentioned resignation of Darryl MacDonald was the result of a conflict between the director and board members regarding the artistic direction of the Palm Springs International Film Festival (Dawes, 1993, para. 2). Robert Koehler (2009) explains that most board members “usually know little about cinema” (p. 82). Therefore the governing position of board members raises the possibility of internal clashes over ‘perceived’ board interference that can ultimately influence the importation of resources

due to operational haggling. Alan Franey (in Tanner, 2009), the executive director of the Vancouver International Film Festival discusses the intricacies of this situation:

I think a Board should know when to hire a competent person, and then let that person do it, and leave them alone... I get countless manuals on arts administration, and I have yet to see one that would echo my own sentiment – which is run it like a business, not an arts organization. There are far more events that have been screwed up by the good intentions of their Board than helped. (p. 31)

In order to prevent this type of situation Halfdan Hussey (in Tanner, 2009) advises that when constructing a board of directors it is important to find people

who are very effective at what they do but are also very busy, because they'll want to help you quickly and not be involved in taking control of the organization and getting their nose into things like the daily operations. (p. 138)

Sponsors-based affiliations

Sponsors are organisations, funding bodies, institutions or individuals which contribute to the financial security of a film festival, be it for philanthropic or business reasons, through the provision of monetary, e.g., cash or in-kind contributions. According to SECOR Consulting (2004) sponsorship “accounts for a very large portion of most festivals’ revenues. Beyond being a source of income, sponsorship testifies to an event’s prestige and impact by allowing major companies to become partners” (p. 48). The total amount of sponsorship, and the degree to which sponsorship interaction occurs, is individual to each film festival, and usually governed by commercial-in-confidence clauses, though organisers may be able to choose to make the existence of some partnerships more overt in order to increase the potential for further participant involvement.

According to Paul DiMaggio and Walter Powell (1988), “Government recognition of key firms or organizations through the grant or contract process may give these organizations legitimacy and visibility” (p. 86). Thus, contracted visibility agreements, in the form of, naming rights, logo placement and product giveaways, between film festivals and their sponsors, may be more readily agreed upon, as the image of these participants contributes to the identifiable legitimacy of the event. Michael Lumpkin (in Tanner, 2009) explains how an affiliation between the German-facilitated Goethe-Institut and the San Francisco International Lesbian and Gay Film Festival “gave [the latter] credibility” (p.

130). Similarly, Tony Rayns notes how the involvement of the Pusan City Council in the Pusan International Film Festival positively influenced the acceptance of the event among other resource providers; Rayns explains that as “soon as the City Council came on board, the sponsorship followed” (p. 88). It is interesting to note that when the Hong Kong International Film Festival lost its major sponsor, Cathay-Pacific, organisers continued “staging glitzy events” that had “the effect of concealing any sense of crisis or financial hardship from the public” (Teo, 2009, p. 115). This ‘staging’ of event may be attributable to the conscious decision by the organisers to prevent any possible de-motivation or further loss of participants and their resource input due to a perceived legitimacy problem.

Though sponsorship may be integral to the operation of a film festival it also represents one of the greatest threats in terms of communicating mixed, and often conflicting, messages with regards to the identifiable function of the film festival. For example, Harris (2005) describes how the Sundance Film Festival has “fallen victim to relentless celebrity coverage and the bottomless deep pockets of corporate sponsorship” (para. 2). She observes a growing restlessness between the film festival organisers who understand that the event “couldn't exist without its own raft of corporate sponsors” but ultimately wonders how a dog food company became associated with the celebration of independent films (para. 7). These affiliations are easy points of attack for critics of the festival such as Koehler (p. 84) who considers the event “a horror show for cinema: a place where more bad films can be seen under awful viewing conditions than any other festival” (p. 84).

Galaskiewicz and Rauschenbach (1988) explain that an “understanding of the relationship between the business donor and the cultural organisation is still incomplete at best” (p. 119), and, this is confirmed with regard to film festival operation, where there are a number of sponsorship complexities that may have detrimental effects on resource importation. In an interview with James Quandt (2009), Simon Field explains how the focus of sponsorship is often aimed at an association with “glamorous people” rather than the festival itself; this he explains is a reason why “people who are not film-involved want a festival” (p. 59). However, the involvement of ‘glamorous people’, such as in the case of the Dances With Films Festival with its exclusionary attitude to those without industry standing, could potentially undermine the goal or stated purpose of the film festival, consequently causing it to diminish the perception of its validity.

To further complicate matters, according to Galaskiewicz and Rauschenbach (1988), “corporations may make cash contributions in exchange for a position on the board of directors and shared control over the cultural organization” (p. 119). In such a case the administrative power of a particular board member may override the decisions of other board members and sponsors, thus elevating the potential for internal conflict. For example, Rithdee (2009) describes how the Tourism Authority of Thailand identified the Bangkok International film festival as potentially becoming one of its “flagship spectacles in its annual tourism calendar”, thus that government organisation effectively ‘high-jacked’ the event from the original sponsors, removing them, and subsequently re-designating the dates of the film festival to a month devoid of any other agency activity (p. 128).

The external control that is commonly expected as a byproduct of sponsorship is an aspect of open system operation that has a tendency to complicate matters for many film festival organisers. Ron Henderson (in Tanner, 2009) provides further insight into the give-and-take of this aspect of participation by advising film festival organisers to ask themselves the following question:

How much do you give up in order to get money... In those kinds of relationships, you need to look exactly at what it is they want, and what you’re going to have to give up and whether you can live with that or not. (p. 123)

The complications that arise due to conflicting wants and needs of a film festival will be the chapter that this study dedicates to the discussion of future research.

Strategy six: participation-based incentives

The strategy of offering participation-based incentives utilises the gratification-driven aspect of social system interaction to manipulate resource providers by targeting and promoting those perceived benefits of interaction that are of greatest value to them and to the festival. So, for example, Gore (2001) identifies “10 Important Factors to Consider when Applying to Festivals” (pp. 26-28). These factors range from the festival’s “prestige”, ranked first; to its “location”, identified as fifth; to “fun”, listed as tenth. It is important to note that Gore’s factors and the types of incentives, as well as their inherent value to a resource provider, are dependent upon a number of circumstances, including:

- 1) The reason for participating – a distributor, celebrity, or film critic may attend a film festival as part of their job while a member of the general public attends for entertainment or education.
- 2) The need for participation – Beauchamp and Behar (1992) describe the ‘must

attend' relationship that exists between the Cannes Film Festival and the film industry, likening the festival to "an international summit, the annual convention of all those who have anything to do with filmmaking. It has become the annual crossroads for the world's film industry and now almost demands participation" (p. 23).

- 3) The benefits of participation – SECOR Consulting (2004) identifies that government agencies become involved in film festivals that are seen to have "significant (direct and indirect) economical impact, as well as important social and cultural benefits" (p. 5). Through their support, these agencies may achieve recognition thereby providing "ideal leverage for achieving cultural objectives" (p. 5).

The concept for this strategy is based upon aspects of Exchange Theory as well as Resource Dependency Theory. Galaskiewicz and Rauschenbach (1988) explain the former in explicit open system terms by saying:

Exchange Theory assumes that the acquisition of scarce resources is of primary importance to the organization. Although organizations may prefer to remain autonomous, as open systems they need to secure resources from actors in their environment and will engage in exchange transactions to do so. (p. 120)

The use of participation-based incentives is a means of ensuring that a film festival will have the best opportunity to access the resources required for operation. As noted by Parsons (1951), it is the "structure of the relations" that occurs through interaction that gives a social system its form (p. 25). If film festival organisers are able to successfully promote a 'structure of relations' that presents the optimum advantages of interaction, it is very likely that resource providers will not only develop an expectation as to what the benefits of interaction should be, but also display a preference for those events that are understood to deliver these benefits. It is this preference that connects this strategy to Resource Dependency Theory.

Resource Dependency Theory understands organisations to be dependent upon their environment for resources (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). This has been understood to manifest in the reliance of a festival upon the resources imported from its resource providers. However, should a film festival achieve a reputation for delivering highly sought after benefits of interaction, it is possible that a resource provider could develop a dependency upon the film festival to perform a particular function. For example, Jonathan

Rosenbaum (2009) indicates the business-based incentives for attending Cannes: “I wound up meeting more people there in ten days than I’d met in Paris during half a year” (p. 153). A similar sentiment is expressed by Joe O’Kane (in Beauchamp & Behar, 1992) of the San Jose Film Commission who maintains that the “cost for me to come to Cannes is the same as a week or ten days in L.A. and I get more business done” (p. 310).

When a situation such as this develops, an organisation is understood to have achieved the height of its organisational power in terms of resource control (Pfeffer & Salancik, 2003). With regard to film festival operation, this means that event organisers will then have a greater degree of influence over the importation of resources and may begin to restrict the type of interaction the event engages in. So, the Slamdance Film Festival is able to limit “submissions to films without domestic theatrical distribution, by first time feature directors, and with relatively low budgets” (Burton, 2005).

It is the achievement of this reverse dependency situation and the control it affords film festival organisers that motivates the implementation of this strategy. It is not enough however, for film festival organisers to simply state the advantages of participation in order for this strategy to take optimal effect. Rather they must initiate a process in which the value of interaction becomes assessable by the resource provider in the form of, for example, testimonials to other potential participants. When *The New York Times* identifies the Seattle International Film Festival as “one of the most influential film festivals in the world” (Gore, 2001, p. 324), or *Movie Maker* magazine considers the American-based *Angelus Awards Student Film Festival* the “best film festival bet” (Garcelon, 2005, para. 2), this can serve to validate the importance of the film festival.

Like testimonials, the presentation of awards may also be used to determine the value of participation. Frater (2005) reports that the Japanese-based *Skip City International D-Cinema Festival* awarded ¥10 million (AUD\$89,000) as a first prize (para. 4), but awards can also take the form of original French paintings (Beauchamp & Behar, 1992, p. 357), or even land in Taos, New Mexico (Gore, 2001, p. 330). The most important aspect of such an award is that it must be useful to the recipient. Tony Rayns (in Tanner, 2009) explains how awards are only of value if they help a filmmaker: if a cash award “can give a leg up to a new director who could almost certainly use the cash, [then] cash is more valuable than some hideous statuette!” (p. 91). Peranson (2009) also comments on the

influential power of monetary awards saying, “the best way for festivals to work to attract the films that they want is with, no doubt, cold hard cash” (p. 32).

Incentives may also be reputation-based. De Valck (2007) notes that awards, or even acceptance at a particular film festival, provide a sense of “brands” for marketing purposes (p. 112). She explains that these ‘brands’ are intrinsically connected to film festivals’ role as “sites of passage” which serves as a “gateways to cultural legitimization” (p. 38). Therefore distributors, filmmakers and sales agents will actively search out and enter those festivals that represent a cultural seal-of-approval through their identifiable functions or legitimising affiliations. Similar reputations are made with regards to fraternisation at particular events. For example, Ebert (1987) describes how “critics meet again and again during the festival [Cannes], at luncheons and dinners and cocktail receptions and parties” (p. 90).

The variety of incentives available to promote resource provider interaction is potentially boundless given the individual nature of participation, but this also means that some incentive-based strategies may not be applicable given the structure of the film festival and the resource providers involved. Fishkin (in Tanner, 2009) explains that filmmakers often inform him that if the Mill Valley Film Festival was competitive and gave awards that they would be more likely to participate (p. 27). Such a situation can put tremendous pressure on an organiser to incorporate competitive aspects into a film festival so as to better suit the needs of the participants. Tim Highsted (in Tanner, 2009) notes that while awards may increase the number of entries into a film festival, facilitating a competition is often challenging:

It’s expensive to run, and it’s complicated in terms of how the jury’s going to operate, and how fair the system of judging is going to be. You have a lot to deal with, like: What sort of awards are you going to get, where’s the money going to come from, is it going to be a cash award, is there a ‘uniqueness’ to the awards, are you simply going to give the “best films,” or an “audience award”? You have to think through what the award structure is going to be and why you’ve got it. (p. 48)

Furthermore the addition of a competition may actually be to the detriment of the film festival, as most competitions are aimed at non-established filmmakers thus dissuading known filmmakers from participating. Ron Henderson (in Tanner, 2009) describes how he

had to make personal contact with Woody Allen to assure the filmmaker that the Denver International Film Festival was non-competitive:

I had to write him, personally assuring him that our festival was *not* a competitive festival, before he would even let his films open the fest. There's a strong feeling among some artists that they don't want to have anything to do with competitive festivals. (p. 123, emphasis in original)

A similar situation may arise when film festival organisers develop a film market or distribution arm in an attempt to gain more business-related film industry attention. For example, the *Moscow International Film Festival* is reported to have appointed an "Industry Officer in an effort to stimulate business" (Birchenough, 2005, para. 11). While such activities may draw good attendances – over 8,000 people participate in the Cannes affiliated Le Marché du Cinéma (de Valck, 2007, p. 113) – there are no guarantees that they will actually generate additional participation for that particular event. Emile Fallaux (in Tanner, 2009) describes how for its first twelve years the International Film Festival Rotterdam's film market, CineMart "didn't get attention" (p. 57). Simon Field (in Quandt, 2009), who replaced Emile Fallaux as the director of Rotterdam, notes that its distribution arm of the festival is facing similar difficulties. According to Field, "[i]n Rotterdam, energy is used up trying to do distribution, when it could be used to rethink how some sections of the festival should work" (p. 71).

The effective implementation of a participation-based strategy begins with a need for interaction. Fishkin (in Tanner, 2009) explains that the first assessment film festival organisers must conduct should be to determine if a demand exists for the film festival's particular services (p. 20). This is done in order to understand the likelihood of resource provider participation. Without a viable function, it is highly unlikely that film festival organisers will be able to motivate enough resource importation to sustain operation, regardless of the use of importation-based strategies.

If a demand for a particular service is identified, film festival organisers may then implement participation-based incentives aimed at those resource providers who are most critical to operation. These incentives construct a particular frame specifically designed to promote the benefits of participation. For example, the American-based *Edmonds International Film Festival* advertises that it will arrange "four scheduled-for-you meetings in Hollywood with a reputable, recognized manager, an agent and two production

companies, plus cash” for award winners (Gore, 2001, p. 274). Similarly, Beauchamp and Behar (1992) detail the “hierarchical order” of distributing access passes at Cannes, explaining that the “laminated badges of diverse colors” clearly identify the areas in which participants are allowed to engage in the film festival activities (p. 231). The strategy of enforcing this hierarchy enables Cannes to motivate those highly sought after resource providers to participate, by affording them special privileges, status and prestige, so that the “white pass is bestowed upon those exalted few who both review films for important publications and cover the social arm of the festival as well” (p. 232).

William Brown (2009) understands film festivals to be “manufactured spectacles” (p. 220) and the implementation of this strategy of providing participation-based incentives is a contributor to this perception. Such ‘manufacturing’ does have its drawbacks. As Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) explain,

competing demands, even if correctly perceived, make the management of organizations difficult. It is clearly easier to satisfy a single criterion, or mutually compatible set of criteria, than to attempt to meet the conflicting demands of a variety of participants. (p. 261)

Thus, the majority of the time film festival organisers must decide which resource providers to target, with a full understanding that there will likely be critical backlash among other potential resource providers. So, for example, Rahul Hamid (2009) describes how criticism was leveled at the New York Film Festival by film critics who viewed the promotional status of some films as one-sided because it exempted them from being reviewed (p. 77). In this situation the incentives to secure films from distributors meant that the film festival would serve solely as a promotional platform and therefore pose no risk to the films’ theatrical profits. Yet, the fact that the critics were unable to review some of the films meant they could not perform their jobs and as a consequence served to lower their incentive to participate.

Such a situation is not limited to individual types of resource providers but may also occur within a single group. An audience, for example, is a heterogeneous entity that must be provided with sympathetically diverse incentives to participate. Gilles Jacob explains that there is “not one public in Cannes, but several. Australians may love a movie that Scandinavians will hate. We must offer as wide a range as possible, from the most popular to the most difficult” (Beauchamp & Behar, 1992, p. 54). A similar division can be found among filmmakers. Gore (2001) notes that filmmakers often have different criteria

to determine the value of participation than other participants (p. 21). However not all filmmakers perceive the benefits of interaction in the same way. For example, producer Mark Altman explains how “word of mouth” created by a screening at Cannes helped *promote* the film *Free Enterprise* (1998) (Gore, 2001, p. 141), while Biskind (2004) explains that Steven Soderbergh was “worried that the good word of mouth his film was generating would *backfire*” (p. 40, emphasis added).

Strategy seven: resource control

The strategy of resource control refers to the influence film festival organisers endeavour to impose over both the stimulation/production of resources and the eventual importation of those resources into their particular event. The employment of this strategy can be seen in the numerous film funds, e.g., the World Cinema Fund or the Hubert Bals Fund, that are used to facilitate filmmaking in nations where film financing is often not available, such as in Africa, the Middle-East or South America.

The film festival’s role to these film funds is that of the exhibitor. That is, upon completion the films are often subsequently programmed into their sponsoring festival thus developing an alternative importation stream dubbed, none too tastefully, “fest incest” by many film festival professionals. Ron Holloway (in Wall, 2009) less than charmingly explains that “fest incest is a festival funding formula that works like a charm”, noting that it is commonly practiced by major European film festivals (para. 12 & 18).

It is important to note that the control which this strategy attempts to manufacture is not absolute, as the importation of resources from the environment cannot be guaranteed; the complexities associated with participation and the film festival’s very position as a site of exhibition greatly reduces the assurance that a resource will be available. Pfeffer and Salancik (2003) present a definition of control that is congruent with the parameters in which this strategy may be implemented: control “is the ability to initiate or terminate actions at one’s discretion” (p. 259).

There are three methods in which the strategy of resource control may be used to influence the importation of resources. The first involves the manufacturing of specialty resources. For example, film festivals such as the multi-national *48-Hour Film Project* (48HFP, 2009) require filmmaking participants to accomplish “all creativity” (para. 22) which includes script creation, production and postproduction within a designated 48-hour time period, in order to be eligible for submission. Similarly, the Australian-based *Tropfest*

(Tropfest, 2008) requires the image of, or reference to, a “signature item” such as dice or an umbrella to be included into each submitted film (para. 1). According to the Tropfest organisers, this signature item is meant to “stimulate and inspire people and to encourage filmmakers to hone their craft, not just drag out last year’s work” (para. 4). Both of these film festivals can be seen to influence the creation of new, unique resources specific to their individual event, thereby successfully initiating the production of resources required for their own operation.

This initiating technique is observable on a much larger scale with regard to the previously mentioned film funds. For example, the World Cinema Fund (WCF) is a partnership between the German Federal Cultural Foundation, the Goethe-Institut and the Berlin International Film Festival. The purpose of the WCF (Berlinale, 2009) is to “help the realisation of films which otherwise could not be produced” (para. 2). Through the WCF, filmmakers from select geographical areas are awarded up to €100,000 (AUD\$160,000) for their film projects. However guidelines stipulate that each production must have a German production company partner attached, thus establishing parameters of production analogous to those of Tropfest and the 48 Hour Film Project.

Though direct entry into the film festival is not officially stated as a requirement, the connection between the WCF and the Berlin International Film Festival is evident. First, the WCF webpage is part of the Berlin’s website, thus the fund is thoroughly branded as part of the film festival. Second, films produced through the WCF are listed as part of the film festival’s program, indicating that the festival has first option of screening any suitable films. In fact, four films from the WCF were awarded the top awards at the Berlin festival in 2009, pointing to a definite connection between the films produced by the cinema fund and its affiliated film festival.

The second method in which resource control influences the importation of resources is through the restriction of secured resources. This method sees film festival organisers accepting resources only under terms of exclusivity. Simon Field (in Quandt, 2009) explains that most competitions require a film’s premiere (p. 70), thus these film festivals are able to effectively promote the operations-driven entropy of other competing film festivals. He goes on:

When we talk about Toronto, Rotterdam, Cannes, they’re all competing with each other and we know now that Toronto is very much preoccupied with world

premieres. Rumour has it that it prevents other festivals from getting films, which is characteristic of every festival that wants to have premieres, to stop others from getting them first. (p. 59)

Some film festivals are less covert in their desire for exclusivity. Hope (2004) describes how organisers of the Melbourne International Film Festival placed a clause into the festival's entry form preventing programmed films from being screened outside of a designated zone (Melbourne, Sydney or Adelaide) prior to the festival, without first receiving written permission (p. 153). Similarly, the entry form and regulations for the 18th Australian-based *Flickerfest* (Flickerfest, 2009) states “due to the competitive nature of Flickerfest, Australian films selected for competition must not have been screened in Sydney within 6 months of the festival dates” (para. 5).

Such restrictions provide film festival organisers with evidence of the value of their event that may be presented to other resource providers – sponsors, critics, audience members – who might then be more motivated to participate due to the uniqueness of the event, in effect succumbing to what Robert Koehler (2009) terms “premiere-itis”. According to Koehler, “festivals yearn to draw as much press as possible, and premiering films constitute news” (p. 86). He also comments that it is typical for film festival boards “to measure success partly on the metric of the number of premieres pulled off, and therefore pressure the director and programmers to come up with a sufficient quota of them for each edition” (p. 86). Similarly, Emile Fallaux (in Tanner, 2009) notes that most programmers only attend film festivals “where you can expect new material” (p. 51).

Programming plays the central role in film festival functionality and is often the first resource that is scrutinised when determining an event's importance, as when Elley (2004) reports that the films in competition at the *Locarno International Film Festival* were the “weakest in several years” (para. 1); or when David Stratton (in Webber, 2005) notes the pivotal nature of the programming of films screened at the Sydney Film Festival by saying “[u]ltimately the Festival must stand or fall on the quality of its programming” (Chapter 2, *The Best and the Most Interesting*, Introductory quote). The impression that a film festival is not attracting the best films can have devastating effects and promote both financial and participation-driven entropy. Film festival organisers counter this possibility by taking pre-emptive action should there be any doubt regarding the quality of programming. So, Marco Müller held a press conference soon after his appointment to announce that Venice International Film Festival had “been offered quite a few films from

the U.S. as world premieres” thus dispelling the notion the festival would lack its traditional value due to a shortened programming period (Vivarelli, 2004, para. 3).

The need to obtain unique films can also be displayed by festivals resorting to the screening of unfinished films. For example, programming at the 2004 Tribeca Film Festival included “a 20-minute exclusive preview” of the animated feature *Shark Tale* (Amdur & Rooney, 2004, para. 12) which would not be released in completed form until later that year. Similarly, Harris (2004b) notes that the screening of “works in progress” (para. 7) such as *The Libertine* (2004) at the Toronto International Film Festival is becoming more acceptable and thus provides an available programming stream for some film festivals.

The third method in which this strategy influences resource importation involves the social system-based concept of participant obligation which stems from the personal connection an individual may have to a film festival. Iordanova (2009) observe that film festival organisers will often create “an ongoing supply relationship with *auteurs* whose films they showcase on an exclusive basis” (p. 26). This technique not only enables film festival organisers to successfully overcome programming shortages – Hope (2004) notes that the majority of the Australian films programmed into the early Sydney Film Festival were supplied by individuals serving on the event’s organising committee (p. 61) – but also permits film festivals to have exclusive access to highly sought-after resources. So, for example, Beauchamp and Behar (1992) comment that the Cannes Film Festival “played a pivotal role in the career of Ingrid Bergman” (p. 27) and caused that actress to display a personal favouritism towards the festival. Such a position allows exclusive access and was manifested in the actress’ participation as the president of the festival’s jury in 1973.

According to Kathryn Bowser (in Tanner, 2009), film festival organisers need to “nurture relationships” (p. 140). This nurturing can occur through the film funds that provide filmmakers with their ‘big break’, as when, as Kerkinos (2009) explains the Thessaloniki International Film Festival-sponsored Balkan Fund enabled recipients to “start their international career” (p. 171), or through the attendance at a festival workshop. De Valck (2007) discusses the opportunities presented to aspiring filmmakers who participate in programs such as the Berlinale Talent Campus. She explains that through “on-the-spot training, festivals help new talent prepare for the transnational practice of the contemporary film industry” (p. 109). This training not only develops a connection

between the participant and the festival, but also increases the likelihood that the participant will be successful in their chosen career path, and thereby be able to later provide a reciprocal flow of resources via the strategy of legitimising affiliation in the form of patronage noted above. This potentially motivates a fresh supply of critics, filmmakers, producers, etc., who will also be open to future interaction.

It is, however important to note that the contrived nature of social systems does not ensure that a participant's obligation to a film festival will always remain. Cousins (2009) discusses the tenuous nature of relationships:

Cannes tends its relationship with Pedro Almodovar with care but if he doesn't win the Palm d'Or there soon, might he switch allegiances to Venice? Venice has, for years, been the festival of choice for Woody Allen but might Toronto or Berlin be making approaches behind the scenes? (p. 155)

The same situation may be true of sponsors. Ed Meza (2009) reports how the main sponsor of the Berlin International Film Festival, Volkswagen, terminated its seven-year long sponsorship of the festival due to the economic difficulties. Although the withdrawal is linked to the "30 per cent drop in film festivals' sponsorship revenue" predicted by Nick Roddick (2009) due to the Global Financial Crisis, Volkswagen's non-participation in the festival clearly demonstrates the fickle nature of resource control. It is for this reasons that SECOR Consulting (2004) advised that the Vancouver International Film Festival work "towards securing multi-year sponsorship" (p. 49) in an attempt to enable the film festival organisers to gain a degree of control over the withdrawal of resources.

Strategy eight: sanctioning organisations

This strategy sees film festival organisers adopting specific codes of practice into their operational structure so as to be eligible for accreditation/membership into an external organisation. This accreditation/membership is a social system-based construct that identifies the film festival as being a 'preferred' site of exhibition to various resource providers, including film producers, distributors, film critics, guild members and members of different academies, e.g., the Czech Film and Television Academy.

In a manner similar to the strategy of employing legitimising affiliations, approval by a sanctioning organisation validates the functional purpose of the film festival. This is a concept acknowledged by DiMaggio and Powell (1988) who note "[p]rofessional and trade associations provide other arenas in which center organizations [in this case, film festivals]

are recognized” (p. 86). This recognition is however, fundamentally different from that gained through legitimising affiliations in that it is entirely externally driven.

There are currently two types of sanctioning organisations. The first type governs film festival activity and includes organisations such as the French-based *Fédération Internationale des Associations de Producteurs de Films* (FIAPF), the Belgian-based *European Fantastic Film Festivals Federation* (EFFFF) and *European Co-ordination of Film Festival* (ECFF). These organisations set their own standards of film festival operation which film festival organisers must implement in order to be eligible for accreditation. The rationale for adopting these external standards into a film festival is linked to the additional resource importation-based opportunities that accreditation presents through both designated supply channels, e.g., members of the organisation, and the prestige that results from affiliation. Hope (2004) considers FIAPF accreditation as “not simply a means of obtaining high-quality European releases, it was also a way of maintaining the higher status and prestige of Sydney and Melbourne within the competitive world of Australian international film festivals” (p. 227).

Sanction by this particular type of organisation represents recognised operational accountability. This accountability is likely to improve resource importation because it presents for resource providers the expectation of a known and approved quality of interaction. As previously mentioned, Parsons (1951) explains that interaction between two actors is more likely to occur if the “optimization of gratification” can be assessed, i.e., the benefits readily identified. Sanction from these organisations provides the capability of such assessment.

The rules imposed by a governing body present a framework upon which such an assessment may occur. For example, FIAPF proclaims that its accreditation “constitutes a trust contract between those festivals and the film industry at large”. There is also the expectation that festivals “implement quality and reliability standards that meet industry expectations” (FIAPF, 2009, para. 1). Therefore resource providers understand that participation in a FIAPF accredited film festival ensures the following operational guidelines:

- Good year-round organisational resources
- Genuinely international selections of films and competition juries
- Good facilities for servicing international press correspondents

- Stringent measures to prevent theft or illegal copying of films
- Evidence of support from the local film industry
- Insurance of all film copies against loss, theft or damage
- High standards for official publications and information management (in the form of catalogue, programmes, fliers)

The concept of a ‘trust contract’ is discussed by Meyer and Rowan (1983) who in their investigation of the organisational formal structures observe that “many organizations actively seek charters from collective authorities and manage to institutionalize their goals and structures in the rules of such authorities” (p. 29). Thus, through the implementation of FIAPF’s ‘trust contract’ or ECFF’s “Code of Ethics” film festival organisers are in fact communicating a shared set of values and expectations. Without this understanding film festival organisers may encounter a resistance from resource providers that do not fully understand a festival’s operational practices. This is a point discussed by Webber (2005), who recounts how the Sydney Film Festival required FIAPF accreditation due to the fact that “major film producing nations would not send their films halfway around the world without some protection of their interests” (Chapter 2, para. 36). It is interesting to note that the *Flanders International Film Festival* published an advertisement stating that the festival has “built a strong reputation as the world’s very first FIAPF recognized competitive film event that celebrates music and its impact on film” (Cowie, 2002, p. 345). Similarly, the Slovenian-based *Ljubljana International Film Festival* is described as being a “member of the FIAPF since 1992” (Stolberg, 2000, p. 223). Such overt examples of FIAPF accreditation are undoubtedly meant to frame the festival as a unique, important and sanctioned event.

The second type of sanctioning organisation does not govern film festival operation but rather forms accreditation-based partnerships with film festivals in order to represent their particular special focus/interest. For example, Fédération Internationale de la Presse Cinématographique (the International Federation of Film Critics (FIPRESCI)) is an organisation whose membership includes “professional film critics and film journalists, established in different countries for the promotion and development of film culture and for the safeguarding of professional interests” (FIPRESCI, 2009). Additional examples of this second type of sanctioning organisation include the Network for the Promotion of Asian Cinema (NETPAC) and the International Federation of Film Societies (FICC).

Accreditation by these organisations may be used by film festival organisers to establish event legitimacy. For example, the *Chicago International Film Festival* is described as “one of two US sites to award the FIPRESCI prize” (Cowie, 2002, p. 339). Similarly, the *Stockholm International Film Festival* is lauded as the “only Scandinavian festival recognized by FIAPF, it hosts a FIPRESCI jury and is also a member of the European Coordination of Film Festivals” (Cowie, 2002, p. 367). Such a distinction may be used to influence potential resource providers who will associate the film culture aspects of FIPRESCI with the film festival itself, and also to motivate certain resource providers into interaction due to the presence of an international jury made up of FIPRESCI members to award a ‘prize’ in the name of the organisation.

Additional benefits of this type of sanctioning organisation include a direct line of contact between film festival organisers and the resource providers the event is most dependent upon for operation. The FICC publishes “festival reports” in which members of the organisation discuss programming aspects of a particular film festival, so, for example it is remarked of the *Cracow Film Festival*, “as a member of the international jury of the FICC I could appreciate [the] richness and diversity of the pictures gathered together during the five day festival” (Zazaruk, 2004, para. 1). Similarly, the Polish-based *International Young Audience Film Festival Ale Kino*, German-based *International Children’s Film Festival LUCAS* and Finnish-based *Videotivoli Video Festival for Children and Young People*, are all accredited by the International Center for Children and Young People (CIJEF). This accreditation enables film festival organiser access to, and promotion within, CIJEF’s membership circle which includes producers, filmmakers, distributors and broadcasters, and other specialists who are directly involved in children’s programming and production.

It must be noted that non-accreditation does not necessarily mean that a film festival is less effective in its operation. SECOR Consulting (2004) explains that “FIAPF endorsement is not the only warranty of quality of prestige, and no American event belongs to the Federation, not even the prestigious Sundance” (p. 17). And Matthew Hays (2003) reports that when the Montréal World Film Festival lost its FIAPF accreditation in 2003 due to an unsanctioned date shift, the film festival officially announced that festival organisers “did not wish to be ‘accredited’ by an association that has no real authority – over producers, sales agents, distributors or over festivals” (para. 4).

The strategy of resource control results, in its most basic form, in a completely contrived situation where accreditation must often be purchased – Hope (2004) mentions that FIAPF “raised the registration fee from \$500 to \$1,000, suggesting that this increase was justified as ‘a preventative measure for eager enthusiasts’” (p. 159) – and is often only given to film festivals where other interests are involved that ultimately serve to strengthen the authority of the accreditation organisation. Hope, again, (2004) reports the lengths to which FIAPF proposed to go in order to protect rights holders by its “demand[ing] that a film’s musical soundtrack be turned off at film festivals, in order to improve its potential commercial value” (p. 227). In such a situation, where the quality of the screenings is compromised to such a drastic extent, it is difficult to identify the *true* benefit to the film festival.

Similarly, the ‘closed door’ attitude in which many of these sanctioning organisations conduct business and make decisions has led to intense scrutiny of their actual motivations. For example, the FIAPF ‘A-list’ system of accreditation and its festivals, have been described as “pointless” (Cousins, 2009, p. 155), and as examples of “dull, fading, provincial caricatures of the old red-carpet routines” (Quintín, 2009, p. 42), and even, in the case of the *Cairo International Film Festival*, as “the scandal of the Festival circuit” (Roddick, 2009, p. 165). It would appear that the animosity towards organisations such as FIAPF is due to the ‘private club’ feel of the organisation; the specialised nature of inclusion seems to leave many individuals scornful and skeptical of the true importance of the organisation’s sanction and validation.

There is however, no doubt as to the advantages offered by the strategy of sanctioning organisations. Being a part of ‘the club’ can offer a film festival a significant return in terms of securing resources both through membership and through the legitimisation the affiliation provides. There are benefits, too, in terms of instilling a sense of cultural worth and critical exploration that organisations such as FIPRESCI offer, which enable a film festival to gain prestige that only comes from the sanctioning of an apparent authority.

Conclusion

This chapter has identified eight importation-based strategies observed to be employed by film festival organisers as a means of increasing the total amount of resources available to their event; strategies which so employed, promote negative entropy in the

open system that is a film festival. These strategies range from the physical location of an event to the legitimising effect organisers, board members, patrons, and other industry personalities may have on film festival operation through their professional or even associational affiliation. None of the strategies, though, are identified as being superior to another, and it should be emphasised that the successful implementation of any individual strategy is dependent upon the individual characteristics of the film festival. The next chapter will contribute to the discussion of importation-based strategies by identifying and examining the functional importance of these different techniques as they apply to five, specifically chosen, film festival case studies.

Chapter Five

Introduction

In the last chapter eight importation-based strategies were identified and discussed. These strategies were shown to increase the potential importation-related capabilities of a film festival by manipulating the social system conditions that often dictate resource provider participation.

This chapter is an examination of the importation process as it is observed to occur in actual operation, through five specific case studies. The emphasis placed upon the in-flow of resources into a film festival is congruent with the assertion that importation is the single most important aspect of film festival operation within the open system model (OSM). Through the practical application of this OSM the study will expand upon the concepts central to the comprehensive understanding of basic film festival operation and its use in determining the operational longevity of a film festival. These concepts include the disruptive effects of entropy as well as the implementation of strategies designed to improve the importation-based capabilities of a particular event through resource provider manipulation.

A total of ten interviews with film festival organisers were conducted during the course of this research. This chapter contains an analysis of four of those interviews and festivals, presented as case studies and selected for their obvious pertinence to the discussion of the proposed OSM. Each festival is very different in both functionality and form and provides a unique set of operational parameters for analysis and discussion in relation to those OSM characteristics and strategies proposed and observed by this study.

Research has been carried out through the collection and analysis of information generated by each film festival itself, e.g., official programs, web documents, etc., as well as externally published observations and commentary. Unless otherwise noted, all quotes attributed to the festival organisers are derived directly from the transcripts of their respective interviews to be found in the Appendices.

The first four case studies represent ‘snapshots’ of operation and while thoroughly investigated, research was limited by the understandable reluctance on the part of the festival organisers to be wholly forthcoming with details regarding finances, e.g., how much funding a specific sponsor provides, or other information that could potentially jeopardise resource provider relations or supplies. The presentation of each analysis is

indicative of these constraints on research. That is, the importation process of each case study is presented not as a linear whole but rather in terms of overcoming particular open system conditions. The number of conditions examined varies according to the operational diversity of the environment, therefore, some film festivals are more likely to have experienced several different open system conditions while others may have experienced very little change, and this can be seen to represent a stable environment.

A list of the four case study film festivals and the order of their appearance in this chapter is as follows:

- Denver International Film Festival: an international film festival;
- Insect Fear Film Festival: a content specific film festival;
- Haydenfilms Online Film Festival: a virtually-based festival; and
- The Shoot Out 24-Hour Film Festival: a franchise film festival.

The fifth and final case study is conducted from a film festival organiser's view point and is based upon the practical experience of the author who, through a fourteen-month directorship of the Gold Coast Film Fantastic (GCFF), was able to assess, hypothesise, formulate and apply importation-based strategies identified by this study in an effort to promote negative entropy and re-start the defunct film festival. Joshua Gamson (1996) conducted research through a similar 'embedded' position in order to experience a "full festival cycle" while performing duties such as serving on committees, previewing screenings as well as working at the actual festival itself during its operation (p. 239). However his role was not as influential in the operational design as that which was undertaken by this author.

Unlike the initial four case studies, the presentation of information for GCFF is not fragmented but rather represents a continuity of resource importation-driven action on the part of the festival organiser. Such a continuous embedded research position within a film festival is considered to be unique and so is advantageous in gaining a complete understanding of the connectivity and decisional chain-of-events that influence film festival operation.

In order to display the particularised application of the OSM strategies, those terms developed by this thesis, and defined in Chapters Three and Four to describe these strategies will be *italicized* on their first appearance. It is hoped that this will serve to

indicate to the reader the generalised applicability of the open system concepts identified by this work and the OSM strategies employed by the respective organisers.

Case study 1: Denver International Film Festival (DIFF)

Background information

The Denver International Film Festival (DIFF) is the largest and most geographically dominant film festival located in the American state of Colorado. Founded in 1978, the festival is non-competitive, and its programs feature films ranging from world cinema, with a specialised focus on eastern European filmmakers, to American independents.

The interview for this case study was conducted with Ron Henderson, the event's founding and only festival director [at time of interview], and Britta Erikson the current [at time of interview] marketing manager. This interview was conducted in person on the 6th of January, 2004, and a full transcript is located in Appendix Five.

Rationale for study

DIFF was selected for study due to the unique and highly effective *importation-based strategies* which have enabled the film festival organisers to not only operate the film festival continuously for a thirty-two year period but also to expand the physical duration of the festival from its original ten-day period into a year-round facilitator of film culture through the creation of the Starz Filmcenter, in which the festival is the operational partner. Additional incentives for examination include critical praise of the film festival by *Variety* which includes an assessment of the event by Robert Denerstein (2002) as a “durable example of a city festival” (p. 325) and one of the “best-kept secrets on the international circuit” (p. 334). Thus, DIFF presents an appropriate model of a large international film festival with a diverse and multi-leveled open system operational structure.

The specific open system conditions examined in this case study provide an insightful analysis as to how the organisers have aligned the strengths of the festival so as to best engage the specific requirements of the various resource providers over the course of thirty-two operational cycles. Two open system conditions will be discussed:

- The difficulties encountered when commencing film festival operation in a geographic location un-familiar with the concept of a film festival, and the

important role which the initial importation-based strategies played in defining the event against other, more dominant social events in Denver.

- The need for the festival to have access to year-round funding which ultimately led to the creation and establishment of the Denver Film Society (DFS) as an umbrella organisation for the film festival. This new operational structure enabled the festival organisers to diversify the event's potential income streams, as well as advance the authoritative position of the film festival within the immediate environment.

Introduction of the film festival

The decision to organise an international film festival in Denver in the late 1970s posed a number of operations-based challenges that immediately influenced the open system operation of DIFF. According to Ron Henderson the notion of facilitating a film festival in Denver arose when several individuals from within the local community identified a “vacuum” in the area of the arts. It was suggested that a film festival could fill this arts-based void and so a volunteer board was assembled and festival operations commenced.

The film festival was underwritten by a Denver-based bank which allowed the organisers a USD\$100,000 (AUD\$107,400) line of credit (Henderson in Tanner, 2009, p. 124). This enabled the organisers to focus on structuring the event with very little immediate threat of *financially-driven entropy*. That is, organisers were not forced to secure sponsorship or apply for funding to ensure operation, but rather had a readily available financial source that could be drawn upon, thus streamlining operations. Interestingly, Henderson (in Tanner, 2009) admits that, at that time, the ability of the film festival to pay back this loan was not completely known (p. 124). In fact, as Henderson informed this researcher the acceptance of the film festival by the Denver community was generally ambivalent, a situation he describes as deciding to “give it a try, run it up a flag pole, and see if anyone would salute it or not”.

Much of this ambivalence stemmed from the relatively new appearance of film festivals within the American cultural scene. According to Henderson, “[a]t that time there weren't all that many film festivals in the United States, but there was one ironically at the time in a very insipient stage, in Telluride, Colorado”. Those film festivals functioning in the United States at this time include: the San Francisco International Film Festival

(commenced in 1957); the New York Film Festival (1962); the Chicago International Film Festival (1965), Seattle International Film Festival (1972); and indeed, the Telluride Film Festival (1974).

Of these film festivals the closest geographically to Denver is Telluride, taking seven hours by car from the state capital to reach the secluded mountain town. Despite Telluride's isolation and operational newness, organisers of that festival had already established something of a reputation and had secured the participation of festival guests such as Gloria Swanson, Francis Ford Coppola and Leni Riefenstahl (Telluride, 2009). In fact and somewhat ironically, the total number of guests attending the festival often outnumbered the local audience members, thus the event resembled more of an exclusive gathering of glitterati than the popular, internationally-attended film festival it has become today.

Given the isolation of Telluride, it is likely that very few Denver-based individuals or organisations had had contact with that particular film festival. Such a lack of exposure is identified by this study as a major factor influencing the open system operation of the event. As has been noted, the decision to participate in a film festival may be enhanced if *potential resource providers* know what *gratification* is to be gained through interaction. Therefore, the absence of a foundational understanding meant DIFF organisers would need to construct a paradigm that enabled potential participants to view interaction in terms of what they were most likely familiar with. This paradigm would be the implementation of an *identifiable function*.

Robert Denerstein (2002) explains that it was understood that if DIFF were to operate it would need to develop “sufficient energy and faith to attempt a major addition to the city's cultural landscape” (p. 325). In order to generate this image the film festival organisers promoted the festival as having artistic significance. According to Henderson:

Our mission was, for the most part, to celebrate and cultivate film as an art form, to bring films to Denver that you would not get to see in commercial cinemas, and to provide a platform for filmmakers to interact with filmgoers.

This identifiable function not only established the organisation's territory within Denver's 'cultural landscape' but also closely aligned the function of the film festival with one of the city's newest cultural entities, the Denver Centre for the Performing Arts (DCPA) which

had been founded only a few years previously, in 1972. The DCPA is an organisation which declares itself to be “dedicated to excellence in the arts”, and to function as “a showcase for live theatre, a nurturing ground for new plays, [and] a preferred stop on the Broadway touring circuit” (DenverCenter, 2005, para. 1).

The similarity between DIFF’s mission of cultivating film as art and DCPA’s dedication to the arts is viewed by this study as a strategic means by which film festival organisers were able to frame the potential participants’ understanding of the function of the film festival. That is, it positioned the film festival as an event that offered an experience entirely different to that of a commercial cinema and more in line with the artistic and cultural fabric discerned to be lacking in the community.

As previously discussed, there is an inherent risk involved with the alignment of a festival with identifiable functions; a risk that requires film festival organisers to fulfil stated goals or undergo questioning as to the event’s legitimacy. In order to bring to Denver films that represented non-commercial/artistic work, the festival organisers decided that their focus would be “concentrated on new international cinema and American independents”. According to Henderson, this undertaking was made “before the word ‘independent’ meant what it means today... films that, for the most part, were not available to the film-going public outside the context of the festival”.

The selection, successful acquisition, and programming of these types of films enabled the film festival organisers to display their legitimacy to the Denver community. However, programming is only a single aspect of the larger and infinitely complex system of exhibition. Other aspects of this system that require addressing include but are not limited to: the securing of appropriate venues; negotiations for, and logistics of print acquisition; and performing basic film festival protocols in the form of scheduling films, writing film reviews, co-ordinating pre-screening introductions, etc. Impressively, all these aspects were accomplished through the efforts of DIFF board members, who did not serve as mere advisors, but also participated as the physical operators. These members included “filmmakers, people who operated art cinemas, PR types, [and] film teachers”.

The *organiser-based* and *board of directors-based affiliations* of these individuals with DIFF posed immediate strategic benefits. For example, the art cinema-owning, board members provided their venues as in-kind sponsorship (Henderson in Tanner, 2009, p. 124) thus granting the festival access to its ideal audience-type while simultaneously limiting

the financial costs of the event. Similarly, Henderson had previous experience operating a student film festival in New York, and was able to work with specialty distributors he knew personally to secure a number of films he and others identified for programming (Henderson, 2005, personal email correspondence).

The final aspect of the festival's mission statement, 'to provide a platform for filmmakers to interact with filmgoers' also bears a particular resemblance to the function of the DCPA as a 'preferred stop on the Broadway touring circuit'. As previously discussed, the *legitimising affiliation* of a special guest can have validating effect on the perceived worth of the film festival. According to Henderson, the lack of film festivals operating within the United States during the late 1970s meant that "if you're telling someone you are honoring them with a tribute or whatever, they were much more open to [attending]". So, the film festival was able to successfully secure the participation of "special effect wizard George Pal, animators John and Faith Hubley, experimental filmmaker Stan Brakhage, Spanish director José Luis Borau and Canadian documentary filmmaker Harry Raskey" (Denerstein, 2002, p. 326). Through the attendance of these filmmakers the film festival was able to prove to the Denver community and beyond that, it had significant stature and facilitated a subsequent ability to secure the participation of the film industry's most talented members.

Henderson attributes much of the success in securing these participants to "luck", however there is much evidence of the implementation of what this study has termed the strategy of legitimising affiliation, since one of the festival's programmers "worked on a Robert Altman film so he knew Robert Altman personally and was able to contact him".

Interestingly, the original concept of guest involvement in DIFF would become one of the most significant contributors to the identity of the film festival both within the Denver community and the broader international film industry. The precedent set by the organisers had far reaching effects. For example, the participation of Charles Champlin, a highly respected Los Angeles-based film critic, would not only announce the successful operation of DIFF on the cover of the *LA Times* Arts section, but ultimately, as Henderson states, establish the festival "on the map with the [film] industry".

Similarly, the tribute award system would become stronger with the attachment of specific patrons' names. According to Britta Erickson "one of the things that has legitimised our awards is the co-operation of film artists whose names we have the Awards

in [honour of]”. As of 2005 DIFF’s three named tribute awards – the Krzysztof Kieslowski Award for Best Feature Film, the Maysles Brothers Award for Best Documentary and the John Cassavetes Award – were actively used to secure the participation of influential members of the film industry. So, the John Cassavetes Awards has been received by Steven Soderbergh, Jim Jarmusch, John Sayles, Errol Morris and Sean Penn. Henderson confirms this assessment by explicitly stating that “I think those names make a very strong statement about the legitimacy of this festival in the eyes of the film community, nationally and internationally”.

Through the operation of the first Denver International Film Festival, the event’s organisers were able to successfully adapt the operational structure of the film festival to the demands and limitations of the open system environment. As Henderson (in Tanner, 2009) notes, “there was a tremendous response in the community, which meant that the festival was a good idea, it was needed, it was providing a service” (p. 124). In subsequent editions, film festival organisers would no longer encounter the same degree of operational ambivalence, but rather would have an *identifiable function*; a niche from which the manipulation of resource providers could begin, thus increasing the likelihood of inputs into the event.

The next open system condition discussion begins with the identified need for the film festival organisers to establish the Denver Film Society (DFS) as the overarching organisation under which all future DIFF operations would be conducted.

Establishment of the Denver Film Society

The first operational cycle of DIFF presented a financial anomaly. First, the film festival was able to operate with very little influence from financially-driven entropy, as the event was underwritten by a no-interest loan from the Denver-based bank. Yet the organisers were able to post a net profit, thus, proving to potential resource suppliers, e.g., philanthropic foundations, that the event was economically viable given its pre-existing financial base in combination with in-kind support from key resource providers. Such a situation is extremely rare as most inaugural film festivals post a financial loss. For example, Lory Smith (1999) explains that the Utah/US Film festival (the precursor to the Sundance Film Festival) posted a deficit of USD\$40,000 (AUD\$43,100) and organisers, “quickly discovered that there was no real way to raise money [unless they were] planning

to do another film festival” (p. 24), a manifestation of that ‘stealing from Peter to pay Paul’ strategy previously noted as a sign of financially-driven entropy.

The fact the film festival posted a profit was, according to Henderson, instrumental in the decision to continue operation. However, the second cycle of open system activity would prove to have a different, seemingly more serious set of conditions. According to Henderson, DIFF “had no umbrella organisation, no other income-generating activities, not even nonprofit status”. The effects of financially-driven entropy on the festival would inevitably see the film festival become “under-resourced in terms of the kinds of things we needed to do, like hire a full-time development director, membership director, public relations director, operations manager and the like”. Thus, the film festival organisers began to experience the *interconnectivity of entropy* and quickly reached the conclusion that “when your tickets are four or five dollars and you do one event a year, it’s hard to sustain [operation]”.

In order to begin promoting *negative entropy* organisers needed to modify the film festival’s structure so as to present a greater and more diverse opportunity for resource importation. Similarly, there needed to be a re-configuration of the gratification potential which financial resource providers could identify through interaction. The first action took the form of a *co-operative alliance* with another organisation. According to Henderson DIFF “partnered with another non-profit in order to legitimise us as a cultural organisation so we could receive tax-deductible contributions and donations from corporations and foundations”.

The nonprofit nature of this alliance gave the film festival an additional incentive for interaction and provided the event with an income stream that could support operation. However, as Henderson explains, operation resembled “playing the survival game” which included “competing with lots of other nonprofits organisations”. Loretta Inglis and Stella Minahan (2006) explain that to be successful in this type of competitive environment requires the implementation of strategies that effectively promote one organisation over others that share the same status.

Film festivals, due to their characteristically short period of operation, are restricted in terms of the exposure they can provide, which Erickson illustrates as the fact that DIFF is “in realistic terms, on paper, it’s ten days out of an entire year”. Thus, a film festival is

severely disadvantaged in terms of the exposure it can offer financial supporters compared to other, more frequent or longer lasting events. Henderson explains further:

We always had a pretty good, strong corporate sponsor base because film festivals offered really a good platform for name branding and for client and employee entertainment opportunities. But it was limited because there was such a short window of time opportunity, Essentially, a two-week bang for your sponsorship buck.

In order to increase this ‘bang for the sponsorship buck’ organisers would need to develop a more year-round presence. This development did not occur until the third operational cycle when the organisers officially became incorporated as their own nonprofit organisation thus allowing for the formation of Denver Film Society.

The creation of the DFS resulted in a number of importation-based advantages. First, it enabled organisers to broaden the opportunity for interaction. As Henderson, explains the DFS “started doing an Oscar Party as a fundraiser every year. We established a membership base”. In later years this membership would be recognised as one of the most valuable assets of the Society. According to Erickson, DIFF has a “finite capacity” in the form of the number of seats that are available for each screening. This presents a natural threshold as to the total amount of input that can be received from a particular source, i.e., festival attendance. However, through a DFS membership this threshold could be expanded – this concept too, will be discussed in greater detail shortly.

Next, the formation of the DFS enabled the organisers to assume cinematic authority within the region. That is, the establishment of the Society identified its organisers as *the* “premier film culture in Denver and in the Rocky Mountain region”. It is interesting to note that the establishment of the Denver Film Society occurred in the reverse order of most typical organisation-based legitimising affiliations; generally the film festival is created by the organisation, not vice-versa. Though the outcome was beneficial to the film festival in that it enabled greater access to resources through year-round visibility, it did not provide established social or operational channels. There were ramifications, too, in terms of branding. As Erickson explains “everyone knows the festival; that’s a given. A lot of people still to this day still don’t know that the Denver Film Society is the producing entity of the Denver International Film Festival”. Yet such a technicality does not have any major detrimental effects on operation or importation.

The role as the facilitator of ‘film culture’ within the region placed the organisation atop the film-based events hierarchy, resulting in preferential treatment and access to greater importation potential, thus increasing activities such as co-operative alliances with Denver-based ethnic and religious groups which may themselves have been interested in facilitating a film festival. For example, in 1996 the DFS partnered with the Jewish Community Center (JCC) to create the Denver Jewish Film Festival. According to Henderson the two “became equal partners. We [DFS] did the programming, they [JCC] provided the venue and did the operations, and we promoted it together to our respective memberships and constituencies”.

Though the festival was likely to attract only a select group, this co-operative alliance would contribute to the diversity and reputation of the Society so that with the Jewish festival we started to get more year-round visibility and more of a year-round presence so that it look liked the Denver Film Society was a year-round organisation rather than just the annual film festival and the Academy Awards Oscar Party.

Following the successful implementation of this co-operative alliance, the DFS was subsequently contacted by a local government to help operate a similar event for its community. Henderson remembers that the DFS “were approached by the City of Aurora [a Denver suburb] to produce an Asian film festival. The largest Asian population in Colorado is in Aurora... and the city wanted to provide more cultural activities”. In total, between the years 1996 and 2004, six new niche film events were established through the assistance of the Denver Film Society.

These events enabled the DFS to strategically fill the calendar; beginning in March with the Mountain States Gay and Lesbian Film Festival; through April with the Denver Pan African Film Festival and XicanIndie Film Festival; into June with the Aurora Asian Film Festival; then June through August with Film on the Rocks; and finally culminating with the facilitation of DIFF in late October/early November. This series of events can be seen as continuing *re-energisation* the community for DIFF, allowing organisers to build awareness, as well as providing incentive for financial sponsors to take advantage of this additional exposure.

These co-operative alliances also enabled organisers to push through two importation-based thresholds. The first threshold was attendance-based. According to

Erickson, DIFF attracted twenty-five thousand people annually. Now, with the inclusion of the co-operative alliance facilitated niche film festivals, the total attendance at DFS events began to reach a hundred thousand. The result of this attendance increase allowed organisers to breach a second threshold which threatened to see the DFS stagnating in terms of the gratification it could offer certain financial participants. Thus, as the number of attendees at the film festival grew larger so too did the incentives for sponsors to become more involved.

The first sponsor to increase its financial involvement was the Starz Entertainment Group (until 2004, Starz Encore) in conjunction with the Anna and John J. Sie Foundation.¹⁶ According to Henderson DIFF/DFS's "relationship with Starz Encore has evolved into a major partnership. Early on, they were a medium-level sponsor: ten, fifteen, twenty thousand dollars a year. And we kept enriching that partnership". This partnership reached new heights in 2000 when the company increased its funding of DFS to USD\$5 million (DIFF, 2000). However, this funding did not come without conditions: first, the \$5 million in funding would need to be shared between the University of Colorado at Denver and the DFS and be used as a catalyst for increasing "Denver's presence as a film community, both for film education and for film festivals" (Denver, 2000, para. 3); second, Starz Encore would have naming rights of DIFF until 2010 (Starz, 2005).

The incentives for Starz Entertainment's increased involvement may be deduced by using the OSM. The company is owned by Liberty Media Corporation which is based in a suburb of Denver thereby offering the potential for *gratification through local sponsorship*. The increasing attendance numbers can be seen to have the potential to motivate Starz to increase its profile within the Denver metropolitan area as a shrewd marketing strategy. In 2001 Starz Entertainment purchased the movie division of Black Entertainment Television, later re-branded as Black Starz (Starz, 2005a). Through its sponsorship of the DFS, Starz Entertainment would be also become sponsor of the Denver Pan African Film Festival, so providing the company with direct access to its target demographic. The general audiences attending DIFF are likely to also be interested in a premium movie channel which would provide further potential for resource provider gratification.

¹⁶ John Sie is the founder and Chairman of the Starz Entertainment Group, the Anna and John J. Sie Foundation is a philanthropic organisation dedicated to "new educational opportunities that will ultimately lead to better film and television for all people" (CUDenver, 2008, para. 2).

Examining this situation from another angle, the partnership with the DFS was a critical aspect in facilitating the Starz FilmCenter which was established in 2002. The Starz FilmCenter lauds itself as the “only true cinematheque, committed to presenting the best in film art” (CUDenver, 2008, para. 1) in Denver. Thus, the partnership can be seen to serve two functions, first by aligning the Starz FilmCenter with the “authoritative film entity in Colorado” (Erickson in Rose, 2002, para. 17) therefore legitimising the functions of both entities, and second, through the access to resource providers, such as DFS membership holders and DIFF audiences and guests, that the partnership would allow the Starz FilmCenter to achieve. By stipulating that its \$5 million funding be shared by both the DFS and the University of Colorado at Denver expansion into the operations both film and education related endeavours could become possible.

It is interesting to note that beginning in early 2000s the Starz Encore began to expand its role in the on-demand television market – 2001 saw the first cable launch of Starz On Demand while in 2004 Starz Ticket on Real Movies was launched – which Starz touted as “first ever premium broadband download on demand movie service” (Starz, 2005b). So there is potential, too, that the partnership with the DFS could be a strategic move towards Starz Entertainment developing an all digital theatre.

Another sponsor to increase its funding of the DFS was the Science and Cultural Facilities District (SCFD). This funding body distributes “funds from 1/10 of 1% sales and use tax to cultural facilities throughout the seven-county Denver metropolitan area” (SCFD, 2007, para. 1). Funding is administered through a three-tiered system; Tier One receiving the highest legislated funding from the scheme and Tier Three the lowest. Initially the DFS was only eligible for Tier Three status.

According to Erickson Tier Two status is “based upon attendance and budgets” and so “we [DIFF] were for years just a ten-day event not able to bump into the [next] Tier”. However, the combined attendances of the niche film events provided the DFS with the numbers required to be attain Tier Two status. “So overnight, one year to the next,” says Erickson, “we went from getting \$35,000 [USD] from this purse, from the SCFD...to having a steady funding base of almost half a million dollars”. Additionally, the Tier Two status placed the DFS into an elite group of Denver organisations since only twenty-three Tier Two grants are allocated each year, and include those made to such organisations as

the Colorado Symphony, the Museum of Contemporary Art/Denver, Opera Colorado and the Colorado Ballet (SCFD, 2007).

As a result of breaking this economic threshold the DFS has been relieved of the financially-driven entropic influences it previously encountered, and that, as Erickson explains, “was a big change in this organisation. That allowed everyone to take a breath and start thinking creatively and more strategically about what the next twenty-five years look like”. Among the strategies being considered at the time of the interview was the limiting of co-operative alliances the DFS had with community organisations. According to Erickson, “we’re assessing all those festivals and some of them we are choosing not to continue to do and we are bringing in some new ones that are missing from the cultural fabric”.

2009 open system condition point identification

This section concludes the case study by identifying those open system conditions that are influencing film festival operation in 2009.

- Operations-driven entropy in the form of internal unrest – in June, twenty-one staff members of the Denver Film Society, including long-time employees associate director Britta Erickson, programming director Brit Withey and artistic director Ron Henderson resigned due to internal conflicts with a recently appointed executive director, Bo Smith. (Kennedy, 2009). However, these resignations were withdrawn when Smith later resigned and was replaced by a long-time DFS board member, Tom Botelho (Brooks, 2009, para. 1). Had these resignations actually been carried out there was the potential for a diminished ability to acquire particular resources such as celebrity guests and filmmakers loyal to festival staff, thereby resulting in the potential loss of some films. Henderson’s departure from the organisation could have been especially devastating given his history with the event and within the community, as Henderson was ranked fifteenth out of twenty-five of Denver’s “movers and shakers” only a few years previously (Rocky Mountain, 2005, para. 1). The loss of his experience and connections to the film industry would have deprived the festival of a powerful legitimising affiliation that would have been difficult to replace. That the ousted Smith had worked for twenty-one years at the Boston-based Museum of Fine Arts (Burr, 2009, para. 1) and brought his own skills set and channels of acquisition to the position is an important,

though ultimately moot, point to raise, since it is possible that he may not have been able to stem any resultant entropic tendencies the reshuffle caused.

- Financially-driven entropy in the form of general economic difficulties – The impact of the World Financial Crisis has caused the level of financial support previously given to the DFS to decrease. According to Botelho (in Brooks, 2009) “groups who gave us sponsorship in the USD\$20,000 range before the financial crisis were coming in with much lower amounts, but we were able to make up some of that with grassroots support” (para. 3). This ‘grassroots support’ may help to solve income problems this year, but funding from both the SCFD and the Starz Entertainment Group are also potentially under threat as the distribution of funds by the SCFD is legislated to end in the year 2018 and the Starz Entertainment naming rights sponsorship only is contracted until 2010 (Starz, 2005a).
- Participation-driven entropy in the form of competing film festivals – Claire Martin (2009) reports that now “Colorado annually hosts more than 50 film festivals” (para. 1). This situation is radically different from the open system conditions faced by DIFF organisers in 1978, and poses importation-based challenges in an environment which may become depleted of resource opportunities through a saturation of the film festival niche. That is, DFS organisers may have difficulties motivating filmmakers, audience members, sponsors, the media, etc., to participate in DIFF due to reasons ranging from a failure to re-energise the environment, to the existence of more choices for audience attendance. A flow-on affect of such an audience reduction can be seen in its possible impact on the attendance-based requisites for Tier Two SCFD funding.

The interconnectivity of the entropic types can be clearly seen in this latter case, where *participation-driven entropy* is inextricably woven with the potentially deleterious effects on financially-based resource importation. It remains to be seen if the position of the DFS as the ‘state authority’ on film will allow it to remain functioning at top of the film festival hierarchy of the state.

Case study 2: Haydenfilms Online Film Festival (HOFF)

Background information

The Haydenfilms Online Film Festival (HOFF) is an Internet-based film festival owned and operated by Haydenfilms, an independent production and distribution company located in the American state of Pennsylvania. Founded in 2004, the festival is competitive, programming only short films up to ten minutes in length. Films selected into the festival's program are screened via the Haydenfilm.com website.

The interview for this case study was conducted with Hayden Craddolph, the founder, festival director and president of Haydenfilms. This interview was conducted by phone on the 16th of January, 2005, and a full transcript is to be found in Appendix Six.

Rationale for study

The Haydenfilms Online Film Festival (HOFF) was selected for study because its operational structure represents a 'hybrid' in which modified, and potentially more efficient, means of open system interaction are utilised in conjunction with traditional, yet, largely ceremonial aspects of institutionalised film festival operation. Not only does this case study provide a starting point for future research into the functional role of Internet-based film festivals but it also enables a critical understanding of the drawbacks of virtually-based open system interaction that have prevented Internet film festivals from becoming the preferred models of operation up to this time.

The specific open system condition examined in this case study is the need for film festival organisers to address and ultimately reframe resource providers' perceptions regarding the legitimacy and benefits of participating in virtual film festivals. As explained by Craddolph, the early 2000s posed a challenging time for online film festival organisers due an underlying mistrust of the Internet and the "scamming" commonly associated with businesses "you can't touch". The perception of this 'scamming' behavior is elaborated upon by Chris Gore (2001) who contends that the "web is an amazing new medium, but I must warn you that some online festivals are merely scams used to gather free content" (p. 397).

The idea that Internet film festivals swindle filmmakers for 'free content' can be seen to arise from two factors. First, most online film festivals are overt in their financial goals. For example, *Shortbuzz.com* (Gore, 2001) reports:

we provide a free venue for filmmakers to screen their work, we don't ask for the exclusive rights to their film (like other websites do) and we offer filmmakers 50 percent of the profits from any sale of license of their film that Shortbuzz orchestrates! (p. 404)

Such blatantly expressed profit-driven motives are typically disguised by the traditional, physical film festivals, where they are, for example, presented in the form of a distribution deal, a film market, etc.

Similarly, many online film festivals double as distribution companies, such as the *Digidance Digital Cinema Festival* which claims that its festival “was formed to promote digital production and digital distribution” (Gore, 2001, p. 400). In a similar manner *Big Film Shorts* identifies itself as “a distributor and sales agent for short films” (p. 399) and *ShortTV* regards itself as “a truly independent short film channel and Internet company” (p. 404).

The second factor leading to suspicion of online festival organisers, and one that is most likely the result of the aforementioned distribution role, is that Internet film festivals have an atypical *operational cycle*. That is, unlike traditional film festivals which are often held only once a year, most online film festivals promote themselves as being in perpetual operation., The *DDPTV Weekly Film Festival* explains that “[e]ach week, three videos submitted will be broadcast... Each weekly winner is then entered into the Film Festival Finals” (Gore, 2001, p. 400). An identical weekly operational structure is utilised by *New Venue* (p. 403), and the *Sync Online Film Festival* programs new films on a monthly basis and proclaims there are new winners every minute – this festival never ends” (pp. 405-406).

The ‘scamming’ appearance of this rapid operational cycle is a necessary function of Internet film festivals’ attempts to enter the *resource environment* of television or downloadable daily content providers. Again, this is a function of a profit-driven operational structure as those businesses that support online film festivals – *The Bit Screen* is hosted on *Broadcast.com* (Gore, 2001, p. 400), *Got Film Fest* is affiliated with *iWonderfilm.com* (p. 402) – would not profit from a year-based cycle of operation as consumer demand is based on day-to-day accessibility.

This day-to-day accessibility is seen by some as removing the ‘event’ aspect of the film festival experience and is a point Gore (2001) bemoans when calling into question the validity of the events as ‘film festivals’. According to Gore:

The most important thing you need to know about online film festivals is that they are not really festivals... a real film festival takes place where people can interact in the real world. It's the difference between watching a movie at home on television or seeing a film on opening night with a packed audience. There is no comparison. (p. 397)

In light of the open system parameters identified by this study, Gore's contention that there is 'no comparison' between traditional film festivals and online film festivals can be called into question.¹⁷ This study considers Internet film festivals as 'real' film festivals due to the inherent and therefore comparable operational dependency the events have upon the *importation* of new resources and their subsequent *transformation*, *exportation* and *re-energisation* in order to promote operational longevity and achieve an exhibition-based goal. The high-rate of operational frequency is not so much a decision of the organisers but is a pre-requisite for effective online operation that can simultaneously give a functional advantage to online film festivals over traditional film festivals. That is, given the acquisition of the proper equipment and connection, an Internet film festival may be facilitated at anytime, anywhere, and to anyone, thus allowing operation to become more individualised to the participant, as scheduling and *geographic location* cease to exercise determining limitations to their interaction. This is a condition recognised by the festivals themselves, as evidenced by the previously mentioned New Venue online festival, whose very name testifies to the changing environment in which exhibition may take place. In fact, through an online existence film festivals are likely to encounter significantly less *operational* and *financially-driven entropy* than their physical counterparts.

For the purpose of this case study only that period leading up to the completion of the first cycle of film festival operation will be examined. The reason for focusing on this specific period of time (2002-2005) is to best present the conditions faced by HOFF organisers with regard to this specific open system condition. That is, the first year of operation posed one of the most challenging periods of operation due to the relative newness of the Internet. Later cycles of operation benefited not only from the fact that the film festival was becoming more established but also from the implementation of virtual technologies aspects into everyday life, i.e., resource providers as a whole, were becoming more accustomed to the World Wide Web.

¹⁷ This is a topic that will be explored in greater detail in the next chapter.

Strategies employed by HOFF organisers to increase the likelihood for *resource provider participation* began two years prior to the commencement of the actual film festival. Craddolph relates how in 2002, organisers established a HOFF homepage that contained “a flash animated piece with a logo and an e-mail link”. The designation of a homepage served two strategic functions. First, ownership of a URL (or web address) is comparable to a traditional film festival establishing itself in a geographic location but with the advantage that participants need not travel there, but could in effect bring the festival to themselves. The organisers were able to purchase a URL that was indicative of the film festival by name – Haydenfilms.com – thus enabling Internet search engines to locate the festival’s web page with ease. Second, though the web page initially had very little content it did feature a contact link. Thus, organisers were able to easily facilitate interaction with potential resource providers which enabled the film festival organisers to begin developing relationships with those participants interested enough to e-mail HOFF.

The web page existed in this form for eighteen months at which time, Craddolph says, HOFF organisers “started adding some small, other components” consisting of links for the purchase of HOFF merchandise, in the form of t-shirts, hats, etc. In a similar manner to the e-mail address, this merchandise provided a means of interacting with the festival’s intended community. It also served as branding for the event and provided HOFF with a tangible product that could be used to provide *participation-based incentives* and reassure potential participants of the legitimacy of operation.

During this introductory phase, the organisers were also determining the best model of operation. According to Craddolph, “I looked at the Sundance Online Film Festival. I thought they had a unique model [and] based on the brand recognition obviously they had”. HOFF was not afforded the same *legitimising affiliation* as the *Sundance Online Film Festival* had achieved with its traditional physical festival, and so the organisers began to investigate those aspects of that festival which presented potential weaknesses. The purpose of this investigation was to determine how HOFF could present the best possible online option. Interestingly, the organisers did not identify ‘traditional’ physical film festivals as potential competitors. Rather, according to Craddolph they viewed only those online film festivals such as the Sundance Online Film Festival, *Amazon Films* and a potential start up festival proposed by Tribeca Film Festival, as rivals.

Through his examination, Craddolph was able to identify three aspects of pre-existing online film festival operation that he could exploit in order to give HOFF importation-based advantages: the quality of the individual media players utilised by other film festivals; the lack of a substantial reward for resource provider participation; and the absence of a collaborative networking system for filmmakers and their audiences. Each of these aspects will now be discussed further.

Three importation-based advantages of HOFF

A media player refers to the technology used to ‘play’, i.e., exhibit, a film and is the online equivalent of a projector, be it digital or film-based, within a physical film festival’s operational mechanics. After having tested the media players of various online film festival, especially that used by the Sundance Online Film Festival, Craddolph declares that he “wasn’t completely impressed with their player and I figured I could do better”. Those online film festivals with players that exhibit films in poor quality are unlikely to *re-energise the resource environment* in that they discourage both filmmakers and audience members from repeated participation. In fact, the type of player used may also be framed as a participation-based incentive in the form of participants access to a unique elite technology. So, for example, *Studentfilms.com: The Online Student Film Festival*, boasts the use of “Quick Time technology (which is getting better every day)” (Gore, 2001, p. 404) and Sputnik7 media player which is touted as offering “the world’s first real-time audio/video Internet entertainment experience” (p. 404).

The second aspect of pre-existing online film festival operation Craddolph felt he could exploit was the general lack of prizes offered by the events. According to Craddolph:

If I created a \$10,000 grand prize... it would validate our online festival as a premier source to send in films from throughout the world. We felt we could be a true player in the online film festival market.

The incorporation of the USD\$10,000 [AUD\$10,940] grand prize serves several strategic functions. Most importantly it represents a participation-based incentive and an alternative to the type of *gratification* on offer by other online film festivals such as *Zoie Films Internet Film Festival* which presents the “Zoie Crystal Star Award and Certificates of Merit” (Gore, 2001, p. 406) or the *Webdance Film Festival* in which the most “popular films receive nothing but the recognition of their peers” (p. 405).

Additionally, the grand prize provided another tangible asset of film festival operation in that, similarly to the merchandising available on the HOFF website, it represented validation through its very physicality. This aided the organisers in overcoming those challenges stemming from the previously mentioned perceptions of the online medium as being scam-based.

The third aspect seen as missing in pre-existing online film festival's operational structures was that of an organised 'meeting place'. Craddolph notes that most of the other online festivals' websites "had a player and you could go watch the movies and things like that. But you really didn't have an opportunity to network or collaborate with other filmmakers". The role of a film festival functioning as a gathering point for the film industry is understood to be a vital part of operation (de Valck, 2007; Ebert, 1987; Beauchamp & Behar, 1992; Bart, 1997). SECOR Consulting (2004) discusses this role in greater detail:

All industry professionals report that they attend film festivals to meet colleagues, forge ties, etc. This is a vital dimension for any festival, and its success depends first and foremost on the organizers' ability to attract professionals and to create a convivial, efficient environment conducive to meetings and contacts. (p. 44)

This 'vital dimension' was identified by HOFF organisers and a "collaborative" component was the next dimension to be added to the festival's website in the form of a "crew database".

It is important to note that the 'crew database' was implemented prior to the official call for entries was announced. Craddolph's rationale for this was his identification of the fact that in order for HOFF to successfully build a participation base, there would need to be incentives for visiting the website. He elaborates:

What would be the real reason to keep coming back to Haydenfilms?... [if] there has been a call for entries or a call to action saying well, the festival is going to come about in August 2005, there would be no reason to come back to the site.

But if we created a crew database and a production board [then] filmmakers could start posting their experience online and start using it as a free tool.

Thus HOFF organisers began by *importing* the contact details and production information from resource providers rather than films. These resources were *transformed* and *output* back into the environment in the following manner. Both the crew database and the production board were used to list the contact details/production information so individuals

interested in collaborating on film projects, or those productions in need of a crew, could communicate and potentially forge relationships. Craddolph provides following hypothetical situation:

Maybe I'm a NYU [New York University] student and I have a scene that I want to go and shoot at the Philadelphia Art Museum... I can go to Haydenfilms... and see if there are any Temple University students down there that might be willing to work with me on my project.

The *re-energisation* aspect of this process sees finalised film productions facilitated by the HOFF community-networking databases potentially being entered into HOFF. Therefore film festival organisers began to promote the very film production environment from which they would draw the festival's programming, an extremely innovative example of what this study has termed the *strategy of resource control*.

The inclusion of this communal facet had another desirable effect with regard to the later importation of films into the actual film festival. Craddolph explains that "the way we developed the crew database and production board is [that] the website is constantly being populated with new information". Thus, the importation of this information ultimately increased the ranking of HOFF on search engines such as Google and Yahoo and resulted in the event being listed first among all the online film festivals. This point is easily confirmed, as Craddolph points out: "We're number one... we're above Sundance. If you type in "film festival online" right now we're number one". The reader is encouraged to do just that.

The page ranking of HOFF provided the organisers with an extremely advantageous position in that they were able to provide evidence of operational viability and also demonstrate their placement atop of the search engine hierarchical ladder as a form of *legitimising affiliation*. However, such a situation still *cannot ensure resource importation*. In fact, when the film festival officially began receiving entries, the organisers encountered a major dilemma: the types of entries submitted were not appropriate for programming. Craddolph explains that HOFF

started getting these hour-long documentaries, hour and a half-long features, thirty-five minute films. And out of a hundred and five submissions... about forty-five to fifty percent of the films were over length.

While the receipt of unsuitable, unsolicited entries is not the fault of film festival organisers, the screening of such work that does not abide by the parameters set by film festival organisers does pose a threat to the perceived legitimacy of the event. HOFF organisers had set the official duration of short films eligible for entry into the film festival at ten minutes. However, as Craddolph laments, “we got some great films that were ten minutes or less, don’t get me wrong, but the films that ended up being a better quality were fifteen minutes long”. Thus organisers had to make a decision: either to retain the perceived *legitimacy of operation* and program films of inferior quality, or risk a critical backlash and include films that breached the designated time limit. Ultimately, as Craddolph notes, the festival organisers

changed the rules. It was based on the audience. It was based on the filmmakers... Since we were a start-up we said, “listen, we obviously have a great idea here. People have believed in us enough to at least send in their films”.

From an open system perspective the organisers made the most advantageous decision. The fact that almost half of the films were ineligible meant that regardless of the decision only half of participants would be satisfied. It was therefore deemed better to align with the resource providers whose higher quality work presented the best opportunity to promote further participation, i.e., from the quality filmmakers and from gratified audience members, than to risk being seen as a film festival with low quality programming.

Having secured the resources required for programming, HOFF organisers then needed to address the more complex aspect of audience participation. Audiences pose a difficult challenge for online film festivals for several reasons. First, unlike filmmakers, who can be manipulated into participating through the incentive of the \$10,000 grand prize, online audiences are forced to make a commitment of their leisure time. That is, participation in an online film festival does not require the same level of commitment as those who attend a physical film festival. Peranson (2009) explores a similar concept when he explains that art house cinemas naturally attract less people than film festivals because their audiences “surely are more willing to take chances during film festivals, a factor of the system of passes and, also, economics” (p. 24). Second, given that a potential audience participant has both a suitable Internet connection and the time to view films, the film festival must also compete against other new media activities, in the form of video games, web surfing, social networking, etc., in addition to more traditional methods of home-based leisure such as watching television or even reading a book.

HOFF organisers addressed these factors by implementing a strategy which increased the social connectivity of the film festival. Instead of utilising conventional methods of advertising, such as posters, online ads, flyers, the organisers enlisted participating filmmakers to become the ‘face’ of the festival. In order to do this each filmmaker was supplied with a marketing kit. According to Craddolph “[w]e gave them [the selected filmmakers] five hundred business cards, on the front of the business cards was ‘vote for _____’ and we vacuum sealed a sharpie pen”. The filmmakers were then instructed write the title of their film onto the cards and distribute all five hundred among the general public as a means of raising awareness of both the film and the film festival.

Additionally, each filmmaker was supplied participation-based incentives in the form of t-shirts and an instructional document titled “Haydenfilms Strategy for Success”. This document lists ten methods filmmakers could use to increase their chances of accruing votes and included tips such as,

Send emails with our link – www.Haydenfilms.com – to everyone in your address book, and encourage them to do the same. The more members who sign up to vote, the more votes your film will receive!

Filmmakers were also encouraged to “[c]reate a website or blog that focuses on your film, as well as a link to the Haydenfilms festival” (Haydenfilms, 2005).

This deliberate strategy of offering mutual benefits is evident in the festival’s slogan “Our Success is Your Success!”. The fact that the filmmakers could essentially influence the voting system through proactive campaigning represents an original and highly effective means of popularising the event and of developing a social system connection that could motivate participation. Similarly, the organisers incorporated a “Viewer Appreciation Award” as participation-based incentive for audience member interaction. This award, consisting of \$250, would be given at random to a viewer who participated in the event.

The most effective method employed by HOFF organisers to promote audience participation was implemented through the actual judging process. According to Craddolph “I didn’t want people to go away and just vote on their buddy’s film... we didn’t think that was fair”. In order to promote a ‘fair’ voting system, audience members were required to watch at least seven films eighty percent of the way through in order for the vote to count. Thus, HOFF organisers were essentially dictating the parameters of interaction, requiring a

certain level of participation before the possibility of gratification, i.e., voting and entry into the Viewer Appreciation Award, would be accepted.

Having secured both the participation of filmmakers and the 6,500 audience members who voted, thereby successfully implementing the screening and judging process, the organisers of HOFF continued to validate the film festival through strategies indicative of re-energisation. The most prominent of these strategies was the awarding of the USD\$10,000 grand prize at the Director's Guild of America (DGA) Theatre in New York. While the DGA is not directly affiliated with HOFF, the fact that the awards ceremony was being held at this particular location contributed additional prestige to the event. According to Craddolph, the "buzz that's going to be associated with us actually giving out the prize, I think, is going to be invaluable. I think the press that we get from that is going to be invaluable".

Such a strategy was seen to be indicative of unquestionable proof of the legitimacy of the event. Interestingly, award ceremonies are a feature of many online film festivals, e.g., getoutthere.bt.com which hosts *getoutthere live* (Gore, 2001, p. 402), and the DDPTV Weekly Film Festival which has two "Finals" every year in New York City (p. 400). Thus, the implementation of such a physical event is recognised as having a positive influence on the operation of a virtually-based event.

Conclusion

In 2009 the Hayden Online Film Festival still remains ranked first among all the online film festivals on Internet search engines. Having successfully accomplished five cycles of operation, organisers have formed a *co-operative alliance* with a California-based film festival, *HollyShorts*. As Sarah Morgan (2009) reports, this "partnership" (para. 12) sees the winners of HOFF included in the *HollyShorts* program. Interestingly, Craddolph announced his intentions to form a 'partnership' to promote additional distribution in his 2005 interview for this study, taking until now to implement this strategy. This specific co-operative alliance can be understood to strengthen the attractiveness of both film festivals. Such an alliance is not typically found between two film festivals, but due to their operation in different media, e.g., traditional and virtual, these organisations are able to collaborate with very little threat of interference in each other's environment.

This co-operative alliance may prove to be an important strategic move by HOFF organisers. One of the challenges of operating an online film festival is the demand for

content. That is, the on-demand delivery system has the potential to rapidly exhaust the environment of resources, thus, promoting *entropy* and moving an event towards disorganisation. To add to this challenge, many online film festivals advertise the same *identifiable function*. For example: *Reelshort* is designed to “enable talented, emerging filmmakers to gain wider exposure to global audiences and industry leaders” (Gore, 2001, p. 403); the *Yahoo Internet Life! Magazine Online Film Festival* promotes “a viable outlet for independent, shorts, and animation filmmakers” (p. 405); and even the HOFF’s original intentions to provide filmmakers with “another platform to showcase their films”.

This lack of a variety of functions ultimately means most online events are competing against each other for limited resources, and with operational conditions that dictate high levels of content input. There is the potential, then, for this particular type of film festival to reach a saturation point. So the alliance with HollyShort may be critical in differentiating the operational structure of HOFF from its rival festivals and potentially promoting its *operational longevity*. According to Craddolph (in Morgan, 2009) “We see ourselves being a bridge between online and offline content” (para. 10). From an open system perspective this is an ideal position for the film festival as it then has the ability to experience the ‘best of both worlds’ in terms of participation and resource provider availability and to react accordingly to changes in either of the virtual or traditional environments.

Case study 3: Insect Fear Film Festival (IFFF)

Background information

The Insect Fear Film Festival (IFFF) is the first entomology-based film festival to be operated in the United States. It is located in the state of Illinois on the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign campus. Founded in 1983, the festival is non-competitive, screening both short and feature length insect-themed films.

The interview for this case study was conducted with Professor May Berenbaum, the founder/festival director. This interview was conducted by phone on the 6th of August, 2005, and a full transcript is to be found in Appendix Seven.

Rationale for study

IFFF was selected for study based upon the unusual but extremely effective use of *importation-based strategies* that have enabled the film festival organisers to facilitate twenty-six consecutive cycles of operation within a limited niche open system. The

limitations of open system interaction are the result of the event's *identifiable function*, which Berenbaum explains as an attempt "to raise consciousness and awareness and general knowledge about entomology in an entertaining way".

Additional incentives for examination include the appearance of 'copy cat' film festivals, which use a similar organisation-based, *legitimising affiliation* with university entomology departments as a method by which to "entertain and educate the public about insects" (Berenbaum, 2001, para. 3).

The specific open system conditions examined in this case study provide insight into how the organisers have used the formal structure of a film festival as a "vehicle" through which to achieve organisational goals that ultimately have no connection to cinema. Three open system conditions will be discussed. These conditions are:

- The requirement of niche-based, subject material for programming and the potential for *operations-driven entropy* due to resource exhaustion.
- The challenge of presenting an entomology-based, education-driven operational agenda to potential resource providers who may be reluctant to participate given the idiosyncratic nature of the event.
- The advantageous, though theoretically questionable dependency film festival operators have upon the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, as the single largest contributor of resources to the event.

Due to the re-occurring nature of these conditions, this case study will examine those operational cycles up to 2005 and conclude with a discussion of the current operation as at 2009.

Niche-based, operations-driven entropy

The entomological focus of IFFF narrows the potential resource base from which organisers are able to program content. From an open system perspective such a niche-based identifiable function is potentially flawed as the *re-energisation of the environment*, i.e., the production of new films featuring insects, may not be such as to be capable of sustaining the demands of the event, thereby promoting *operations-driven entropy* at an increased rate and exposing the film festival to disorganisation faster. Such a condition could be used to predict the longevity of a particular event. For example, Berenbaum (2005) notes, "the first couple of years it [programming] was easy because I knew about some of these movies but then we got more and more obscure and finding these things is always

difficult”. The ‘difficulty’ confronting organisers was a manifestation of operations-driven entropy.

As previously discussed, this type of entropy is most commonly observed to occur in film festivals which have a mandate to screen premieres. However, the same principles may be applied to IFFF due to the fact that the film festival organisers had structured their entire event around a specialised type of resource that does not exist in great numbers. One of the methods the IFFF organisers have employed in order to control the degree of operations-driven entropy is through screening limitations. That is, from 1984 to 2009 the festival has screened a total of fifty-six feature films (IFFF, 2009). Thus, most IFFF events only screen two or three feature films per operational cycle, effectively slowing the onset of disorganisation by pacing the operations-driven entropic toll each festival has on film resource supply.

Additional methods used to avoid disorganisation may be seen as the implementation of strategies used to promote *negative entropy*. First, organisers are experts in their field and therefore able establish a paradigm for programming that ultimately provides them with the authority to administer the *importation-based strategy of resource control*. That is, Berenbaum’s expert role as a recognised entomologist enables her to structure the parameters in which films are programmed and how the public will be ‘educated’. For example, Berenbaum bases her programming upon a film’s scientific inaccuracies, which include thematic elements involving insects within minor roles or plot scenarios. Thus, films such as *Men in Black* (1997) and *The Relic* (1997) are eligible for programming even though they do not have distinct insect story lines along the same lines as *Tarantula* (1955) or *The Fly* (1986).

This framing has enabled IFFF organisers to access a more ready supply of films. As Berenbaum (2001) explains insects “remain the one familiar and conspicuous group that seems to be politically correct to hate and Hollywood has shown no inclination to stop producing bad insect science fiction films” (para. 3). Thus, by utilising Hollywood’s tendency to misrepresent insects IFFF organisers have essentially broadened the potential resource base of films that could be screened.

This framing technique is further strengthened by a modification of the programming stream that presents each event as having a specific theme. According to Berenbaum:

The first few years we tried to do it all in a timeline, something from the 50s, something from the 60s, something from the 70s or more recent. Then, it seemed that our ability to get a point across was improved with some sort of central focus or theme.

Not only does themed programming enable the organisers to include films with more tenuous insect connections, but the specific grouping of films affords IFFF organisers the opportunity to also include films that are not specifically representative of insect films. For example, Berenbaum explains that “[w]e’ve had a Non-insect Arthropod Fear Film Festival because lots of things aren’t insects that are called insects by scientists in these movies”. Similarly, the employment of themes enabled IFFF organisers to take advantage of current trends in the environment, e.g., an All Cockroach Fear Film Festival was held twice. The first was held in 1991, but as Berenbaum herself reported in the Entomology Newsletter (Berenbaum, 1999) “there were compelling reasons to revisit the group” again in 1997 because “Americans spent approximately \$250 million on poisons designed to kill cockroaches – and then turned right around and spent just about as much money to see movies about them (specifically, *Men in Black* and *Mimic*)” (para. 5).

Extended examples of resource control are evident in the types of work that are programmed. For example, in recent years a number of episodes from television series have been included into the event, e.g., the Las Vegas-based *CSI (Crime Scene Investigators)* episode *Sex, Lies, and Larvae* (2000) screened as part of the 2005 IFFF (IFFF, 2009). While television shows do not technically constitute film they are viable resources and remain congruent with Carroll’s (2006) understanding of the moving image as a filmic entity. The inclusion of television programs, cartoons and movie trailers can be seen as an advancement in exhibition technology. That is, as Berenbaum elucidates, when the film festival first began, the primary medium was 16mm celluloid, however as insect-themed media has become transferred to digital technology organisers have been able to utilise Amazon.com to secure their programming needs via the purchase of DVDs.

Additionally, film festival organisers have utilised an affiliation with the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign Film Studies department as a means of gaining expert insight as to where additional film content could possibly be sourced. Richard Leskosky, May Berenbaum’s husband, a film academic and currently an Assistant Professor and the Assistant Director of the Unit of Cinema Studies at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Urbana-Champaign, 2009), has continually collaborated

with the film festival's programming. According to Berenbaum, "He had an extensive collection himself and knew where to find these things [rare films with insect themes]". Thus, with the aid of Leskosky's cinematic knowledge, organisers were effectively able to expand the resource base to include those films only a specialist could identify, e.g., the twelve-minute, stop-motion Russian film, *Revenge of the Kinematograph Cameraman* which was first released in 1912 and uses stylised models of insects.

It is interesting to note that IFFF organisers have been sent unsolicited insect films by filmmakers. Berenbaum explains that "we get some quirky films on occasion and I'm happy to incorporate them". However, she does not view unsolicited films as a viable importation option as "[o]ne of the most appealing aspects of our festival is that we make fun of the errors filmmakers make", thus there is the potential for misunderstandings and conflicts to arise between filmmakers promoting their work and the festival organisers' emphasis on accurate insect-based education.

The concept of educating an audience by emphasising filmmaking errors positions IFFF as an eccentric event. While this characteristic may motivate some specific *resource provider participation* it also poses a challenge with regard to establishing the festival's event's legitimacy. For example, Berenbaum tells of a previous attempt to facilitate the event at Cornell University which was discouraged because it was seen as "undignified". Such critical perceptions are often applied to niche film festivals as their appeal often requires a particular set of social system values that may not exist in the general public. The ramifications of this open system condition and the methods by which IFFF organisers overcame such perceptions will now be discussed.

Reluctant participation

In organising the IFFF, Berenbaum made a conscious decision to avoid the more common, documentary-type of film festival. This decision was largely based upon the fact that the majority of *audience-based participation* would be comprised of university students and community members with their families. Berenbaum (2001) states that her personal philosophy for achieving a successful educative outcome is to "relate whatever you'd like to say to something that resonates with your audience" (para. 1). Thus, in order to present an event that would 'resonate' and consequently both *motivate* and *re-energise* these groups, an appropriate "vehicle" would need to be used.

Berenbaum opted to utilise commercial entertainment and science fiction-themed films as the primary means of educating the audience about insects. As previously mentioned the concept of a non-documentary, insect film festival was seen as ‘undignified’ by some. However, Berenbaum understood that the majority of audience members would not have a scientific background in the topic, and that narrative, drama-based films, especially those produced by Hollywood studios, presented the ideal option for motivating participation. Berenbaum explains that if “we advertised on campus a lecture on insect physiology nobody would come, but if we advertise on campus an explanation why insects can’t be the size of mobile homes then people show up”. Thus the idiosyncratic nature of IFFF is the result of the event fulfilling the *gratification-based needs* of its audience members for a unique experience.

Interestingly, the fact that the film festival was organised by entomologists had very little impact on the perceived legitimacy of the event as a cinematic entity. Typically film festivals are facilitated by individuals and organisations intrinsically connected to film, e.g., a film society or a film commission. Certainly the involvement of Leskosky would counter much criticism along these lines but there still existed the possibility that a film festival essentially operated by individuals with a non-film background may have been perceived as non-viable. However, as Berenbaum (2005) explains:

In terms of establishing credibility with the audience, I don’t think there was a problem because, the fact [that] we were legitimate entomologists was clear by the nature of the sponsorship. I mean it was the Department of Entomology presenting the Insect Fear Film Festival... we were clearly identified as scientists not fantasy film buffs.

Thus, through the eccentric *legitimising affiliation* with the Entomology Graduate Student Association (EGSA) in its function as an educator of insect biology and physiology, the film festival is, in effect afforded the same authoritative positioning as the Denver International Film Festival under the Denver Film Society. Yet, if IFFF organisers did not have the scientific qualifications or presented themselves differently the festival most likely would not be perceived as presenting the same level of *gratification* associated with the *participation-based incentives* it offers. These incentives range from scientific explanations about insect behavior which include interactive demonstrations, such as a bee waggle dance to illustrate insect communication that was performed for the audience at the

2000 Bees on TV Fear Film Festival, to the opportunity to view rare work such as the *Zorak* episode of *Space Ghost* which was screened at the festival prior to its DVD release.

Participation of other resource providers is also influenced by the unique nature of the event. Although the interaction between film distributors and the film festival organisers is predominantly business-based, i.e., consisting of booking requests and screening fees, Berenbaum explains that the American-based distributor, Swank Motion Pictures has come to expect a yearly phone call from IFFF organisers as they search for programming material. In fact, this relationship has ultimately helped the film festival to secure films for programming as the distributor will often provide IFFF with the details of which distribution companies own specific film titles.

In a similar light, Berenbaum details how a series of phone calls to the Cartoon Network “eventually” gave her access to the “person who does rights and clearances”, resulting in exclusive access to some of the company’s rarest insect-related cartoons. In exchange for this resource all the company requested in return was to “mention that Cartoon Network sent it to us” at the festival. It can quite confidently be contended that this freedom of access is a result of the delightfully unique and idiosyncratic nature of IFFF and emphasises the niche appeal the event has for certain resource providers who identify the event as means of potentially recirculating older and obscure works.

Reporters and journalists comprise other participants who often become involved with IFFF due to its niche appeal. Berenbaum (1999) notes:

Over the years the festival has been featured in the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Washington Post*, the *New York Times*, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Chicago Tribune*, the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, the *Philadelphia Inquirer*, and the *Saint Louis Post-Dispatch*; internationally, the story has been carried by the *International Herald Tribune*, the *Jerusalem Post*, the *London Times*, *Der Spiegel*, and the *Wellington Dominion* from New Zealand. (para. 4)

The appeal of IFFF for media organisations obviously lies in the unusual and ‘up-beat’ character of the event. Berenbaum notes that the first national media attention the festival attracted was due to an “eye-catching photograph” on a “slow news day”. However, there is a certain ‘cult’ quality about IFFF that lends itself to being participant-friendly, so, as Berenbaum proudly boasts, filmmaker Richard Linklater was pictured in *Rolling Stone* wearing an IFFF tee-shirt. The event is perceived as such an entertaining idea that other

institutions have been keen to emulate it and implement their own versions. The Iowa State University Entomology Club, for example, sponsors an Insect Horror Film Festival (Iowa State, 2009) on its campus. Berenbaum is delighted by the compliment because “imitation is the sincerest form of flattery... now a lot Departments of Entomology have these public outreach [initiatives]”, which furthers her aspirations as an educator.

However, such ‘public outreach’ initiatives pose a challenging situation when examined with reference to an open system model of operation as these events are often supported by a *single resource provider* that furnishes the majority, if not all of the in-kind and financial inputs required for operation. As previously discussed, most film festivals divide the financial income between three distinct groups – government grants, private sponsorship and earned income – as a way of preventing financially-driven entropy should a participant withdrawal support. However in a *single source dependency* situation such as IFFF’s, withdrawal of support almost inevitably means instant disorganisation. The ramifications of this open system condition and the methods by which IFFF organisers continue to reinforce the commitment of the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign will now be discussed.

Single source dependency

The IFFF owes much of its operational longevity to the protective environment provided by its main benefactor, the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. This protection is characterised by the relatively low level *entropy* the festival encounters through operation. The lack of entropy can be understood to be associated with the following factors. First, the majority of *operations-based resources*, e.g., projectors and venues, are supplied in-kind by the university itself. Therefore, IFFF has no external equipment costs, with the exception of print rental, filmmaker royalties and the occasional screening of a film that requires special equipment which the university does not own or have access to. Second, the University supplies all funds to the event. Berenbaum explains how “through the EGSA we can get campus funds...the bulk of the funding over the years has been from the campus, the agency that funds student organisations on campus”. Third, the University ultimately supplies the vast majority of participation in the form of the staff and students in the Entomology Department, those non-entomology students who attend the university, and their families, who interact with the event as audience members, as well as the university’s resident journalists.

Thus, all three types of entropy previously discussed by this study are accounted for through the participation of this single resource provider. Such a position within an open system paradigm is extremely risky given the fact that *the constant and continuous importation of resources into an event can never truly be guaranteed*. Factors such as the Global Financial Crisis and its economic fallout could subject the University to hardships which could in turn lead to a cutback on campus activity funding and a resultant cessation of IFFF operation.

Yet, the disorganisation-based danger of a single source dependency within this open system framework does not discourage the film festival organisers from entering into such precarious situations. Indeed there is, to some extent, an advantage in this situation since the film festival organisers need only satisfy the requirements of a single participation-based criterion. Thus, film festival organisers are able to avoid the complexities that arise from conflicting resource provider requirements. Similarly, there is more freedom in operation as event organisers need only keep the best intentions of the sole provider in mind when making operational decisions. Berenbaum is cognisant of this when she explains how extreme care is taken with regard to paying screening fees since, “[w]e’re a public university and the last thing we need is a lawsuit” since such an instance could potentially jeopardise the relationship between the event and the university in its role as resource provider.

So, in order to ensure the benefactor is gratified through interaction, the film festival organisers are observed to implement *resource control* in the form of preventative withdrawal strategies. These strategies are employed in situations where an entropic-threat cannot be dealt with directly but must be addressed through less obvious, secondary means. For example, the gratification the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign receives from IFFF may be attributed to local community relations initiatives instigated by the festival and to the publicity the event provides to the University both national and internationally.

IFFF provides the university with a positive community profile first by the attendance of local individuals at the event, but also through other *co-operative alliances* IFFF organisers enter into, such as a blood donation drive held in conjunction with the 1999 Mosquito Fear Film Festival. While this community interaction does not directly help the film festival to promote *negative entropy*, since neither group of participants

contributes directly to the event – all screenings are free and no money is exchanged for hosting a blood drive – the inclusion of such events ultimately contributes to the overall value of the film festival to the University in the form of community esteem. Berenbaum notes, “[l]ately we’ve had art contests... This is a competition among all the schools in the area, all the way from pre-school up to high school” which provides the University with access to potential future students within the local community. Similarly, the fact that IFFF has continually grown its attendance from originally being held in a 300-seat venue to its current location in the 1,100 seat Foellinger Auditorium is a testament to the drawing power the event, and a reminder that not all resource provision should be viewed through the prism of economic viability.

With this in mind it is interesting to note that 2009 marked the final year of operation for the JVC Tokyo Video Festival (TVF). The event had successfully completed thirty-one consecutive cycles of operation and similar to IFFF operated via a single source dependency upon the Victor Company of Japan (JVC), a manufacturer of audio and video technology.

The immediate position of the festival within the company’s structure ensured TVF had a funding base as well as in-kind access to the JVC theatre located at the company’s head office in Japan. Thus, its operational structure was comparable to IFFF in that it too was buffered from financial-driven entropy. This then begs the question as to how the festival came to be disorganised.

Like IFFF, the operation of TVF was intrinsically linked to the community profile the event afforded the Victor Company, e.g., the first TVF was held the same year the “first portable VHS video system (VHS video cassette recorder HR-4100 and color video camcorder GC-3350)” were released by the Victor Company (Victor, 2008, para. 5). This profile saw entries into TVF increase from 257 films in 1978 (Victor, 2008, para. 3) to 2,231 (TVF, 2009, p. 15).

Thus, the event can be seen as a platform for both raising the awareness of JVC products and fulfilling the demand of video makers interested in screening their work. However, two factors are observed to have subsequently come to undermine the funding of the event. First, the company’s net sales declined from ¥921,978 million (AUD\$11.4 million) in 2004 to ¥658,449 million (AUD\$8.1 million) in 2008 (JVC, 2008, p. 1). Second, a joint merger between Kenwood and JVC in 2008 resulted in the creation of a new

company, JVC Holding, which Steven Kim (2008) explains will now mainly focus on audio technology for cars and homes. Given these two situational changes it seems unlikely that TVF could continue to be seen as serving a viable service to its sole benefactor.

IFFF is in a similar situation should there be a re-ordering of priorities at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. The consequences of resource withdrawal in a single source dependency situation are often immediate. However, given the community support for IFFF it is likely that the university would attempt to ‘phase out’ the festival slowly over time rather than simply cutting off all funding causing instant disorganisation of the event in its current form.

Case study 4: The Shoot Out (SO)

Background information

The Shoot Out (SO) is a 24-hour film festival that requires filmmaking participants to produce an original short film (under seven minutes) within a designated 24-hour timeframe. The festival began operation in 1999 in Newcastle, Australia. Festival organisers have subsequently franchised the event and have sold the Shoot Out 24-hour film festival model to organisers in Geelong (Australia), The Hague (Netherlands), Boulder (America), Hamilton (New Zealand).

The interview for this case study was conducted with Teresa Conicella, a co-founder and current organiser of the SO Newcastle. This interview was conducted by phone on the 6th of October, 2005, and a full transcript is to be found in Appendix Eight.

Rationale for study

The Shoot Out (SO) was selected as a case study due to its unique operational structure which sees the film festival serving as both the impetus for, and the exhibition site of, specially produced films. This dual function represents an unusual open system condition as the event is ultimately responsible for the manufacturing of its own key resources. As previously mentioned, film festivals typically perform primarily as sites of exhibition, i.e., *importing* completed films that are then *transformed* and *output* through programming and screening.

The fact that the event is critically dependent upon filmmakers for its functionality presents a rare opportunity to examine how participation as a whole, e.g., external

involvement in a film festival, ultimately dictates operational longevity. As such, SO also represents one of the few film festivals to successfully implement all eight of the importation-based strategies identified by this study; an operational characteristic that has been duplicated in the Shoot Out's franchised models.

Therefore, in the interest of contributing to the knowledge base which has been accumulated through the previous chapters, this particular case study will be framed around the eight identified importation-based strategies. The purpose of presenting information in this fashion is not only to broaden the understanding of these strategies, but also to enable information to be presented regarding their interconnectivity, a condition that can be best grasped through the analysis of these strategies on a point-by-point basis.

The concentrated nature of the event acts as a catalyst from which the actions of interconnectivity manifest faster and are therefore easier to observe. In nearly all other film festivals the interconnectivity of *importation-based strategies* is a drawn-out affair, sometimes occurring over the course of several operational cycles, such as the instigation of the co-operative alliances between the Denver International Film Festival and its partnered community organisations, which took years to facilitate and to ultimately influence an increase in funding. The condensed operational period of SO on the other hand, permits these connections to be more effectively examined, as they are seen to occur within the weeks leading up to the event and during the 72 hours of actual film festival operation.

The case study will be prefaced with an examination of the origins of the event, and a discussion of those impetuses which led the organisers to develop a franchise will close the discussion.

Event development

The decision to develop a film festival in Newcastle was structured around a re-imaging campaign for the city. Conicella explains the event was:

a marketing tool for a bigger vision...which was the establishment of a regional film industry. And what the Shoot Out was about was an initiative to bring people to the area to have a look at how easy it was to move around.

Thus, the overall goal for the formation of SO was not necessarily driven by film culture but rather, centred on creating an incentive for tourists and filmmakers to visit the city. In this respect the event is reminiscent of other previously mentioned tourist-based film

festivals, such as the Riviera in France or Lido in Italy, however the objective of having people visit Newcastle differed in that the intention was not to extend the tourist season *per se*, but rather to promote the town as future filmmaking location. Conicella explains the *identifiable function* of the festival as being, “we wanted a festival which actually got people here to look at the place so that they may make their feature films here one day”.

The fact that the event was based upon bringing individual resource providers such as filmmakers to the festival posed very challenging operational conditions. First, the structure of the event, i.e., its concentrated, *participation-based form*, relied upon the assumption that individuals would in fact participate. However as has been previously discussed, one the characteristics of the OSM is the *inability of film festival organisers to guarantee constant or continuous importation of resources* into the event. Conicella recognises this aspect of operation, noting the event’s structure “makes it difficult for us too... people go ‘Oh, it’s easy to run a film festival’. It’s not. The difficulty with this one is, we never know how many people we are going to get”.

A second challenge involved those interactions between the SO organisers and the filmmakers which are more intense in terms of the social system-based scrutiny the event is likely to encounter. Conicella notes:

We get bombarded with 1,500 to 2,000 egos. All these egos come to the city and we have to treat them all with care. My role is making sure we deal with those egos properly...When they come to town we have to be careful that we don’t treat them like a number.

The consequences of treating participants ‘like a number’ can be seen to negatively influence the participants’ perceptions of the event, consequently limiting the ability of the film festival organisers to *re-energise the environment* for future operational cycles and ultimately preventing the event from achieving its goal of providing a future site for film production. Thus, the importance of treating ‘egos properly’ is indicative of the complex emotional aspects of participation within a social system; each individual participant represents their own particular set of values which SO organisers must address by treating all filmmakers equally. Conicella explains “when you take it [the film] from them [filmmakers] you have to make sure you respect that film, whether it is a piece of crap or a piece of brilliance”.

This paying of respect is not something familiar to general film festival operation since the majority of film festivals will never have the degree of personal interaction that SO organisers do with their participating filmmakers. Conicella describes how SO gets “a lot of emotional scenes at the end of the day [which marks the deadline for submissions]... We have people in tears and upset and crying and frustrated and angry and throwing things”.

The cause of such emotional scenes provides a further challenge as a major contributor to the *operation-driven entropy* of the film festival. That is, the failure of filmmakers to submit their work within the designated 24-hour time frame represents a self-imposed condition that restricts the volume of importation since filmmakers who are not finished producing their work are disqualified from participation. Such a situation could be reviewed and possibly amended should the total number of films submitted during the 24-hour timeframe be insufficient for operation, but to do so could cost the event its *legitimacy*. To date, such a situation has not occurred, although as Conicella reports “[w]e get a lot of people who don’t make it. Or they just miss by thirty seconds”.

In what follows each of those eight *importation-based strategies* identified in the previous chapter will be examined with respect to their manifestation in SO. Each strategy is accompanied by an anecdotal narrative that illustrates the intentions behind, as well as environmental justifications for the particular implementation of each strategy.

Date placement

According to Conicella there were two main factors that contributed to decision to hold the first Shoot Out on the weekend of July 9th through July 11th. The first factor was that the date fell during a school term break, thus enabling the event to attract more potential school-aged filmmakers and audience members. The second factor was focused more towards the local community and ensured that the film festival would not clash with any other local events. As she explains:

Newcastle is very much a football town. And at the time I’m going, “How are we going to attract people to this festival?”. Because it was in the middle of the winter season; it was football season.

So, in order to avoid any potential loss of participation the film festival was placed at a time during which no football games were organised. Conicella “scanned the football

games and I picked a weekend where the [Newcastle] Knights, which are our local football team, had a bye. So I picked the date and it was based on the bye”.

Interestingly, the decision to facilitate the film festival during the bye week enabled SO organisers to implement another importation-based strategy. Conicella explains “I actually went to Knights and I asked them to make a film, as guest filmmakers... I said ‘It would be really good for us and you’ve got nothing to do that weekend’”. This ‘guest filmmakers’ aspect is indicative of a special guest-based legitimising affiliation and is an example of the interconnectivity that occurs between importation-based strategies. The specific details of this *legitimising affiliation* will be discussed under that strategy’s heading.

Geographic location

There are several geographical advantages to holding SO in a city like Newcastle. For example, the city is located 162 kilometers north of Sydney, and thus the distance isolates the film festival from Sydney-based film festivals, such as the Sydney Film Festival. Yet the distance is not so far that Sydney-based filmmakers interested in participating cannot travel to the event via public transport, e.g., train, or the Sydney-Newcastle Freeway. In 2001, the population of Newcastle was just over 137,300 and has steadily increased in the years since (Newcastle City Council, 2009), thus the location provided a significant potential audience-base without being overwhelming as compared with the nation’s largest population in Sydney.

It is however, important to note that the operational structure of SO, insofar as the influx of out-of-town participants is concerned, presents a potentially damaging characteristic, as the festival could have been viewed as a non-Newcastle event. This non-local aspect is most commonly encountered by travelling film festivals which Deborah Kaufman (in Tanner, 2009) describes as being “notorious problems – they lose money, they don’t relate to the community, they are understaffed” (p. 83).

While SO is not a touring film festival it does have a reliance on participation external to the local community that could potentially deter local acceptance. To overcome this ‘outsider’ perception, SO organisers encourage community involvement, which is an undertaking made possible by the close-knit and parochial nature of Newcastle’s population Conicella explains:

What I encourage the community to do is, if you see a filmmaker ask them if they can use you in the film... We encourage the community to also get involved... I suppose it has a sense of ownership, that the community starts to own the festival because there is nothing like it anywhere else where people are running around making films.

The SO organisers also promote community ownership of the event by requiring each production to include specific items from the community. This film specific requirement not only helps to, as Conicella say “acknowledge the city”, but also ensures the films entered into the film festival are made on location.

Interestingly, Conicella discusses another aspect of operation that is a common problem with touring film festivals: a lack of community knowledge. Tom Di Maria (in Tanner, 2009) notes that the “difficulty with touring is that so much of a festival depends on the sort of grassroots organising in terms of publicity and promotion and marketing” (p. 132). Conicella shows awareness of this when she discusses how the SO organisers “try to make it very grassroots. Very much of the people, by the people, for the people”.

The democratisation of SO within the community is beneficial in that it contributes to the promotion of *negative participation-driven entropy*. “I get volunteers” says Conicella. “And also get students who are students of TAFE or high school who come and do their work placements as part of it [the festival]”. This type of community involvement is more easily facilitated in cities with manageable populations and with little competition from other events and activities.

Co-operative alliances

Conicella explains that “we are in a partnership with councils”, and such a ‘partnership’ not only furnishes the necessary community support by providing a safe, friendly environment for filmmakers to work in, but also ultimately enables SO organisers to achieve their goal of ‘re-branding’ the city of Newcastle itself. Without the support of local government the operation of SO would be difficult and costly in terms of its requirements for film permits and the fulfilling of other city ordinances. The benefits of SO activities to the council include the increased economic activity during the event; the positive community imaging; increased access to a cultural event; and the potential for future filmmaking projects within the area which would perpetuate these benefits.

The festival organisers also form co-operative alliances with individual participants, such as musicians who donate music to a stock library. According to Conicella:

We invite our local musicians to submit music to a copyright released music library. So our local musicians will release their music to us for twenty-four hours then if they get into a film then they release it to us indefinitely... we have I think eight albums at the moment in the library and that [resource] is free for our filmmakers to use.

This alliance was formed in order to curb the use of copyrighted music used by filmmakers. The incorporation of copyrighted music into SO films could make for legal difficulties with regard to the exhibitor-based nature of the event. Since, SO organisers also have a relationship with Aurora Entertainment to screen SO films through its channels the presence of copyrighted music could potentially limit the exposure particular films could have. Local musician involvement represents an innovative and effective means of solving this operational challenge and as Conicella explains it provides “good exposure for the actual filmmakers and the musicians”, so providing *gratification* to other participants through their interaction with the festival.

Identifiable function

The strategy of an identifiable function is used to communicate the role of a film festival as a means of persuading resource providers to participate (and occasionally to discourage participation). As previously mentioned, the SO organisers explain that the purpose of the film festival was the ‘re-branding’ of the city of Newcastle. This purpose, however, does not serve as a wholly appropriate identifiable function given that the organisers wished to attract the volume of external filmmakers the event needed to function. That is, being non-residents the participating filmmakers would have little or no personal interest in promoting Newcastle. Thus, SO organisers utilise the title – Shoot Out 24-hour film festival – and descriptive language as a means of communicating the character of the event in order to attract participation. For example, the catch phrase of the festival is “For filmmakers with guts! Do you dare?” (Shoot Out, 2009). This clearly communicates not only the type of event but also the type of individual that should participate, i.e., an active, eccentric, ‘guerrilla-style’ filmmaker.

The nature of the event and language in which it is couched are understood to be highly successful in promoting resource provider involvement. As Conicella explains “it was amazing how many people came in the first year, and I was completely bowled over”.

Interestingly, the philosophy of the organisers to create “an event, an unusual event, out of a regional area, that couldn’t be done properly in a metropolitan area” motivates a different type of interaction. Conicella explains how she received international enquiries about the event stating, “We are a similar city. We have gone through an industrial age. We have lost all of our industries we are looking at re-imaging our city we would like something sexy and glamorous for our city”. The implications of this interest will be discussed further with regard to the franchising of the film festival.

Legitimising affiliations

As previously mentioned, the decision to organise the film festival during the bye weekend of the Newcastle Knights football fixture enabled the film festival organisers to enlist local football players into a ‘guest filmmaker’ program. The result of this affiliation was extremely beneficial, and, according to Conicella, enabled SO organisers to “establish a profile fairly quickly”. Conicella continues:

It is amazing, you do an arts event [in Newcastle] and you ask the media to come and do a media launch [and] they may not turn up... If you’re the Knights and you do a media launch the media will be there half an hour before the players turn up.

SO the organisers took full advantage of the situation, arranging for the festival’s media launch to be held in the Knight’s football stadium and to feature several of the Knight’s team. According to Conicella “the photo of us giving them [the football players] instructions, cameras and directors’ chairs... got us coverage for a week”. Additionally, the film made by the players was screened on *The Footy Show*, a nationwide sports program. Conicella explains that the festival “had hundreds of people coming to watch [due to the] the fact that we were showing this film”. The ‘guest filmmaker’ program continued annually through 2004, utilising Australian entertainers ranging from musicians to television actors, who on a number of occasions used equally ‘famous’ individuals to participate in their short films (Shoot Out, 2009).

Additional legitimising affiliations utilised by the film festival include the participation of recognisable film industry personnel on the festival’s film juries. These

individuals number actors, awards winning filmmakers, television executives and members of the Australian Writers Guild (Shoot Out, 2009a)

Participation-based incentives

The participation-based incentives implemented by SO organisers have been both monetary – in 1999 SO offered an AUD\$2,000 first prize – and experience-based. Of the latter, Conicella notes:

I've had a lot of universities say to me that the Shoot Out is a good microcosm for the real world. If you do something in the Shoot Out it is one of the best learning experiences of what you need to do [to] make a film and all the things you need to think about.

In 1999, organisers made a decision to advertise the event both nationally and internationally because, prior to the involvement of the Newcastle Knights, they had gained an impression that the local media members would not want to cover the event. One outcome of this widespread advertising campaign was a full page article being published in *Screen International*. According to Conicella, a writer from the magazine showed great interest in the event, considering it a “crazy idea but ultimately worth a “full blown up [*sic*] article”. The attention given to SO via this article can be seen as an invaluable testament to the legitimacy of the event. Additionally, the fact that an entire article, complete with the the festival's branding, was published served as qualitative recognition that could potentially serve as an incentive for participation.

Prize money was seen as a necessary incentive. Conicella explains that “[w]e thought we had better find some money because who the hell would come to Newcastle to make a film”. However, not all filmmaker incentives were financially-based. Conicella notes that SO co-founder Kristi Street, a filmmaker herself, identified an incentive with regard to the immediacy of the outcome by explaining that she felt like “sometimes I just want to make a film, and I want it over and done with but it takes so long”. Thus the film festival offers filmmakers nearly instantaneous gratification with respect to the accomplishment of the task at hand. Additionally, filmmakers have utilised the film festival as a means of testing their skills. According to Conicella these tests range from filmmaker's attempting claymation to conducting the shooting of a film interstate while still abiding by the rules of the event.

Participation-based incentives are not only targeted at filmmakers as SO also implements what is called a Shooting Star competition for actors. In order to ensure a supply of actors for the various productions, the organisers “invite actors to register as the official actors... We usually get around thirty of them”, who provide a pool of available on-screen talent. The Shooting Star competition sees actors competing with each other to appear “in as many films as possible... They can do something in the background and their performance has to be signed off by a producer or the director. So there has to be a legitimate appearance”.

Resource control

The organisers of SO ultimately influence the production of resources for the film festival, however they also impose a number of production-based parameters that impact on the types of films being made. Films eligible for submission are required to be a maximum of seven minutes in length, must contain the specified items from the local community, and must be produced within the designated timeframe; until 2005, all productions had to be edited completely in-camera. Of these parameters the in-camera editing aspect poses the most interesting control measure since, as Conicella explains, “Newcastle didn’t and still doesn’t have a lot of production facilities”. Thus, the in-camera editing requirement represents an operational adjustment to the physical environment of Newcastle. Had this adjustment not been made it is possible that filmmakers would have been de-motivated to participate due to the excessive technical aspects of the production. Filmmakers visiting the location would also have had to transport equipment for editing or enlist the services of a Newcastle-based editing company. The requirement for in-camera editing presented a solution to a lack of resources and enabled film festival organisers to add an additional unique characteristic, or ‘twist’ to the event that would further enhance its identifiable function as a test for ambitious and creative filmmakers.

Another method of resource control may be observed in the personal relationships developed during the festival and the obligation some filmmakers feel to participate in SO. For example, Conicella describes how numerous participants take part in the event annually:

You get to know a team like your family. Lots of people have come back and they challenge themselves. So it’s that kind of growing and you get to know the people, as opposed to a number or a name on a form. You really get to recognise people and remember them.

The use of this strategy is particularly important in strengthening the community support of the event. The annual participation of particular filmmakers can be observed to instill a sense of familiarity with the event and its functions and to provide community members with a sense of tradition, so re-affirming the important aspect of grassroots support.

Sanctioning organisations

Perhaps one of the most interesting aspects of the operational structure of SO is the position the event has itself taken as a sanctioning organisation. The franchising of the film festival has enabled organisers to occupy an authoritative role over other festivals generally filled by organisations such as FIAPF. This authoritative role sees the film festival promoting a particular model of operation that is understood to facilitate and encourage participant interaction.

As previously discussed, sanctioning organisations are external organisations that offer accreditation/membership. Although SO Newcastle is technically a film festival, it is operating, through its franchise in the same capacity as an external organisation. Conicella explains that when franchisees “buy a license they buy all the branding... they use the same operational manual: they get guidance from us. We oversee media releases... if they need a brainstorm [then] they can work with [our] Head Office”. The benefits of such guidance and instruction are essentially the same as those offered by an external organisation in that all sanctioning occurs through SO branding. In fact, according to Conicella, the “only way it is going to make us strong as a network of cities is if the branding is consistent”. Thus, it is possible that should more SO franchises become established, then the ‘network’ of SO film festivals will come to represent a particular standard of interaction and exhibition.

It is important to note that sanctioning organisations develop a membership base so as to ultimately benefit their own operation. In the case of SO Newcastle, developing an accreditation-based franchise prevented the event from being reproduced without due credit: “We did realise that there were people who were copying [the 24-hour model]”. The existence of a similar event could potentially lower the motivation of the filmmaking participants who would no longer view the event as a unique opportunity. Therefore, the effects of franchising have the potential to act as an additional strategy of resource control. As Conicella notes, “the only way we are going to knock these people [copying film

festivals] out is by going and developing a network of related festivals... who are like-minded; who are doing the Shoot Out according to the original rules of the Shoot Out”.

Conscious of those environmental factors that have made SO successful, the organisers are particular in terms of selecting the festival's franchisees, SO Newcastle bases the much of its decision on the proposed location's similarity to Newcastle. Conicella notes that “we sell the license to very like-minded cities or towns. We don't sell it to a metropolitan area, we make sure that the places we sell it to are into re-imaging”. Affiliation with SO also requires maintaining certain operational standards. Conicella explains that each SO franchise receives an operations manual and while noting that “[w]e don't mind modifying things in our manual if it suits a city”, ultimately “the operations manual is there to make sure every festival is run the same way in terms of its logistics”. Other franchise stipulations require the use of the approved branding and the establishment of different operational dates from other SO film festivals, illustrating once again the interconnected nature of these strategies.

It is interesting to note that the concept of franchising the film festival arose from feedback from other cities contacting the organisers for more information about the event rather than being based on any pro-active or aggressive marketing on the part of SO itself. As a result of such feedback Conicella came to the conclusion that “there was an opportunity to sell this [festival model] elsewhere in Australia and the world”. It is for this reason that the model may also be potentially flawed from an open system perspective. That is, sanctioning organisations typically require a certain stature and while SO Newcastle has a community presence, its global recognition is significantly less than that of Cannes, Toronto, Berlin, etc. Thus, the festival will always be subject to the social system biases of the resource provider perceptions dominant in each place of exhibition.

Currently, four franchised Shoot Out festivals exist world-wide (Boulder, Geelong, Hamilton and The Hague). If SO Newcastle organisers are able to continue to establish the reputation of these international festivals through its unique form and potential as a re-imaging technique, the legitimising authority of SO as a brand will increase proportionally. As an added point of interest, much of what the SO Newcastle organisers use as the basis for their festival model was taken from their own experiences in operating the first SO event in 1999. This includes helping franchisee organisers in selecting resource providers to ensure each event has legitimising affiliations, so Conicella claims to “prefer the

entrepreneur or the promoter that we work with to have a strong link to the council. They don't have to work for them but we like them to have a rapport". Such emphasis on the implementation of importation-based strategies is a good indicator as to the festival organisers' unconscious identification of these participants' worth in determining the operational longevity of the film festival.

Case study 5: Gold Coast Film Fantastic (GCFF)

Background

The Gold Coast Film Fantastic (GCFF) is an international film festival located in Queensland, Australia. Founded in 2002, the festival is non-competitive, programming fantasy-based feature films.

Despite the author's personal involvement in this film festival the following case study is written from a third person perspective. The information referenced is indicative of years of involvement with GCFF and where possible and appropriate, official documents are cited.

Assessment of foundational history

The following assessment addresses the rationale behind the formation of GCFF, which began in 1996/1997. The foundational history does not represent actual operation as designated by the open system paradigm employed by this study, but rather informs the pre-planning of the event, i.e., the parameters by which the film festival was planned to function within the Gold Coast community and on an international level.

Such information is of particular value to this case study as the social perceptions formed by resource providers consulted during this pre-planning period played a profound influence in dictating the operational legitimacy of the event once it began the importation process. That is, the *resource providers* were asked for their opinions with regard to how the festival should function and so in effect became engaged in the formation of the event's *identifiable function*. Each external participant framed GCFF operation with regard to their personal/business orientated aspirations, e.g., film production/business, cultural expansion, global community recognition, etc.

From an open system perspective such information is useful in determining those aspects of functionality that are likely to motivate participation, however, if employed too soon in the pre-planning stage of a film festival the identity of the event may become

diluted and lack central focus. Similarly, such input could also become a false benchmark for legitimate operation due to the fact that individual resource providers may perceive their singular contributions to the functional design as being adopted verbatim. Fortunately for GCFF, neither of these two situations was seen to occur, though it is important to note that the ideology set in place during this pre-planning period did ultimately shape how the event would interact with its respective resource providers.

In early 1997 a steering committee was formed to structure the preliminarily operation of the film festival. Members of this steering committee included individuals from local government, the film industry, and a private university. This steering committee established the *identifiable function* of GCFF through a mission statement decreeing that “the Gold Coast establish a world class film industry event incorporating a film festival market and associated cultural activities in the latter half of 1999” (GCFF, 1997a, p. 4).

This identifiable function would be used as a rallying point from which to solicit financial support of the Gold Coast City Council, as well as other government agencies to commission an Interim Report (2000) to be used to determine the best possible model for film festival operation. The strategy of employing the mission statement in securing the funding for this report lay in the recognition of the film festival as a ‘film industry event’ which would promote the festival as a means of increasing film industry activity and “enhance the importance of the Film [sic] industry to the development of our region” (GCFF, 1997b, p. 2).

This film industry ‘development’ was indicative of an overall push to establish the Gold Coast as a major centre for film production. In 1991, the Warner Roadshow Studios was opened on the Gold Coast (Google, 2009), and the members of the steering committee explained that the

development of a substantial film festival, which would ultimately be recognised worldwide as an important festival for producers and directors to attend, would ensure the involvement of other movie personnel and would place the Gold Coast on the world stage. (GCFF, 1997b, p. 2)

Thus the steering committee not only framed the film festival as an incentive which would serve a larger purpose in the successful establishment the film industry on the Gold Coast but also identified those groups whom they perceived as essential participants to the event.

Their oversight, deliberate or not, of a particularly important group of participants will be illustrated later.

In addition to soliciting government support to commission the Interim Report, the steering committee also began to formulate the means by which the event could best establish a distinct level of operation. For example, in order for GCFF to achieve a position as a ‘substantial film festival’, steering committee members proposed a number of strategies seen to increase the likelihood of film industry participation. These strategies included forming ties with two of Australia’s most prominent film industry organisations: the Screen Producers Association of Australia (SPAA) and Australian Film Institute (AFI).

From an OSM perspective, the decision to involve these external organisations can be seen to present the best and most efficient means of achieving the aforementioned mission statement. The involvement of SPAA meant the film festival would partner with “the industry body that represents Australian independent film and television producers on all issues affecting the business and creative aspect of screen production” (SPAA, 2009, para. 1). Interestingly, SPAA is also a member of FIAPF, thus endorsement of SPAA not only represented the sanctioning of Australia’s leading film industry body, but also opened the event up for possible FIAPF affiliation. The involvement of AFI aligned the festival with “Australia’s foremost screen culture organisation” (AFI, 2009, para. 1) and the GCFF steering committee saw a potential opportunity to form a *co-operative alliance* with the organisation with regards to the facilitation of the AFI Awards (GCFF, 1997a, p. 1).

However, as has been stressed throughout this study, the action required to attain such external involvement is often much more challenging to achieve in reality than it initially appears. The first stumbling block the steering committee encountered was the discovery that in order to motivate either SPAA or the AFI to participate “[h]uge sponsorship would be required” (GCFF, 1997a, p. 2).

The issue of sponsorship raised an interesting operational dilemma. It was recognised that in order to attract sponsors there would need to be “some guarantee that this [GCFF] will be the No. 1 Festival in Australia” (GCFF, 1997a, p. 2), yet at that time Australia already hosted three major international film festivals in Melbourne, Sydney and Brisbane. These other Australian festivals were well-established, having an operational pedigree that would be difficult for the GCFF to overtake even if it were to prove itself a legitimately operating event.

Another suggestion was to assess which sponsorship could be motivated if the event was shown to have audience appeal. According to committee member Bruce Molloy (in GCFF, 1997a), potential sponsors would “be receptive to audience dimensions and the propensity for attracting stars” (p. 4). If the film festival could present opportunities for audience member gratification through *participation-based incentives* such as the attendance of a Hollywood star, the event could potentially succeed in convincing a sponsor to become involved. Such a scenario was feasible given the close proximity of the Warner Roadshow Studios and the timing of a major Hollywood production during the film festival.

It is important to note that the steering committee elected to model GCFF on other international film festivals and noted that, should funding be secured to conduct the feasibility report, the film festival models under consideration were those of “Cannes, Sundance, Venice, Edinburgh, Berlin, Hong Kong, [and] Tokyo” (GCFF, 1997a, p. 4). The decision to examine and potentially model these large film festivals is an indicator as to the size and magnitude expected of GCFF. The steering committee also elected to study, with the intention of facilitating, a film market similar to that found at “Nipcom, AFI Americas and ShoWest” (GCFF, 1997a, p. 4). Again, the identification of these markets clearly indicates the steering committee’s intentions for the film festival to represent a major, international event. These early architects saw its future potential as “worth billions to the Gold Coast film industry and the economy of the region” (GCFF, 1997b, p. 2).

It is interesting to note that the original date set in the mission statement for GCFF was 1999. This operational date would not be achieved. However, and by coincidence, that year did see the commencement of a new international film festival on the Sunshine Coast, 148 km north of the Gold Coast. The Noosa Film Festival (NFF) represented the type of ‘world class film industry event’ the GCFF steering committee was hoping to facilitate – the official launch of the film festival was held in Los Angeles and NFF organisers publicly announced their interaction with “international marketing executives in film studios in Los Angeles, sourced films from Berlin, Cannes and Sundance festivals and also formed alliances with the Seattle Film Festival and the New York Film Festival” (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 5).

For all intents and purposes NFF seemed to have the characteristics of a major international film festival, e.g., Hollywood stars, a total income of AUD\$2.5 million and a

range of prominent sponsors including Polo Ralph Lauren, Showtime, *Who Weekly Magazine*, SAAB and Kodak Australia (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 5). However funding issues related to sudden sponsorship withdrawals left the event organisers with an estimated debt of over AUD\$1 million (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 5), and resulted in the event failing to complete even its first operational cycle. In terms of the proposed OSM, this ultimately influenced the receptiveness of the environment for future film festivals. For example, several “industry members” interviewed for the Interim Report stated the need for GCFF to demonstrate cautious operation, noting that a portion of the film industry had been “burned” by NFF.

The failure of NFF served as an appropriate warning to GCFF organisers who, having successfully secured funding to commission the Interim Report, aimed to avoid the same operational mistakes. In fact, a section of the report is dedicated to a case study of NFF titled, “The Lessons from Noosa” which outlines ten specific areas of operation including planning, financial management, importance of media coverage, local community involvement and the “need to start small and grow” (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 8), that the authors of the report felt GCFF organisers should be especially diligent in following.¹⁸

The Interim Report drew its conclusions from surveys previously conducted with “key players in the distribution, exhibition and free to air plus pay TV networks in Australia and overseas” (GCFF, 1997a, p. 3). Each survey participant was asked to comment on the following aspects of a Gold Coast-based film festival: feasibility, tourist market, locations [actual venues], Brisbane International Film Festival relationship, sponsorship potential, content [programming], ancillary events, timing, pricing and packaging, positioning, Australian International Movie Convention connection, Council funding, competition [resources], infrastructure and management and the Pacific Film and Television Commission [State funding body] (Globe Entertainment, 2001, pp. 29-39). From the various survey participants’ responses, three “options” (p. 12) were put forward.

The first option positioned GCFF within the operational structure of the Australian International Movie Convention (AIMC), an annual gathering of Australian distributors hosted by the Motion Picture Exhibitors’ Association of Queensland, and saw the film

¹⁸ The advice to ‘start small and grow’ is recurring theme among the different film festival directors interviewed by Tanner (2009), e.g., Fishkin, Franey, Highsted, Kaufman, Kramer, Elsner-Sommer and Di Maria, who all attribute their success to pacing growth and not attempting large scale events immediately.

festival functioning as the public screening platform for a film industry *only* event (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 12). Thus, GCFF would essentially fulfil the role of a pre-release, commercial cinema event which would either be held concurrently with the Movie Convention or upon its conclusion.

Such a position has its strategic advantages in that it is indicative of an *organisation-based, legitimising affiliation*. The Movie Convention could provide GCFF with access to both programming material, since the “Convention offers an opportunity for distributors to showcase their up and coming films to every exhibitor in Australia” (Queensland Events, 2009, para. 3), as well as a successful operational infrastructure, in that the event had been in operation since 1945 (AIMC, 2009, para. 3).

However, this option also presented a major importation-based drawback as the commercial foundations of the event were likely to disqualify GCFF from government cultural funding. Because GCFF would be organised through the AIMC it would only program films that had secured commercial release in Australia. The fact that only commercial films would be screened would ultimately de-motivate the cultural agency in charge of funding allocations because it would not “subsidise the distributor’s promotion programs” (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 11). This would result in the placing of more financial pressure on the AIMC to cover the festival’s costs; an aspect of the partnership that made the feasibility of this option less likely.

The second option proposed that GCFF “explore the many facets of ‘fantasy’, including horror, sci fi, special effects, thriller movies, animation, fantasy, film noir, magical realism and so on” (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 13). Proposed pre-existing, fantasy film festival models upon which GCFF could be based included the Spanish-based *Donostia-San Sebastian Horror and Fantasy Film Festival*, the South Korean-based *Puchon International Fantastic Film Festival*, and the Portuguese-based *Fantporto: Oporto International Film Festival*” (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 13).

The open system advantages of this model included its uniqueness of operation, as no other Australian film festivals exclusively featured fantasy films. Thus, GCFF would not need to compete for programming and would also be differentiated from other Australian film festivals, thereby increasing the participation-based incentives of the event. Additionally the focus on fantasy would afford the GCFF organisers “the opportunity to concentrate on the ‘people behind the scenes’” (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 15), that is,

it would enable GCFF organisers to secure the participation of highly qualified film industry practitioners who are not necessarily in high demand and are therefore more likely to interact.

Such a unique format is a two-edged sword since the importation-based disadvantages of this model also involve the “niche” framing of the event (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 15). That is, fantasy films may not appeal to a large demographic which would thus limit the audience potential. Similarly, the specialisation of the programming meant GCFF would be exposed to increased *operations-driven entropy* as the “number of films made in the fantasy genre fluctuates, according to fashion” (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 15).

The third option proposed by the Interim Report saw GCFF screening films “nominated either for Oscars or for the AFI Awards” (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 13). Programming streams would be structured according to the nominated films and the event would be held in the period leading up to either the Academy or the AFI award ceremonies. Though there are numerous importation-based advantages with this model, it was seen as too difficult to facilitate due to the secondary-nature of the programming. That is, GCFF would essentially be operating in the same role as a ‘festival of festivals’ with regard to its content. And, as the analysis points out the “Gold Coast cannot ‘own’ these events, which generate from elsewhere, so will not build the profile of the area in quite the same way as the other options” (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 15). This would contradict the initial push to create an event that would promote the area as a filmmaking centre.

One aspect of pre-planning which was clearly overlooked from the open system perspective proposed by this study was the insignificant role the steering committee gave to the Gold Coast community in the physical operation of the event. The pre-occupation with facilitating a film industry event that required film industry members to physically attend ultimately subjected GCFF to greater exposure to *participation-driven entropy*. While it is understood that the attendance of film industry members was needed to ensure the proposed financial benefits to GCFF in the form of, for example, an increase in film production, such reliance upon one group is indicative of a *single source dependency*. Should members of the film industry not attend or interact so as to produce these financial benefits, then the functional role of the event could be compromised.

Evidence of this oversight is observable in the Interim Report which contains very little information as to how GCFF could be made appealing to potential Gold Coast audience members. In fact the majority of information regarding Gold Coast audiences is empirical data, e.g., age demographics, weekly income, household size, nation of birth. Such data is useful when making operational decisions, however, judging from the lack of data analysis and the one-sidedness of the research survey it appears as if the participation of Gold Coast audiences could be assumed and guaranteed. For example audience participation was dismissively, and perhaps condescendingly, identified as benefiting from “[f]anatical followers, who, evidently will travel to such events” (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p .15).

Such a situation is indicative of an ‘if you build it, they will come’ mindset, and highlights the operational challenges of assuming the participation of a particular resource provider. This topic will be further discussed later in this case study.

Assessment of operational history

The following assessment details the operational history of the GCFF from 2002 to 2006, a period of time which is significant for two major reasons. First, it marks the completion of five successful, consecutive operational cycles during which importation streams and the social connectivity of the event were established. Second, the disorganisation which occurred in 2006 may be systematically traced to incidents and operational decisions that occurred in previous years. Such a tracing serves to demonstrate the long term effects of entropy and the cumulative deterioration it has on operational efficiency.

From an open system perspective the initial operation of GCFF was sound and strategic. The film festival had financial support (cash and in-kind) from both local and state funding agencies as well from the Gold Coast private sector, which included sponsorship by Warner Roadshow Studios. The venue for the event was secured in a rapidly growing area of the Gold Coast and the festival’s board represented a diverse and impressive selection of individuals from both the film industry and private business.

In conjunction with this operational structure a number of importation-based strategies were also in place. For example, the event had established *legitimising affiliations* with two prominent Gold Coast-based film industry practitioners in John Cox (1995, Visual Effects Academy Award winner for *Babe*) and Peter Frampton (1995, Make-

up Academy Award winner for *Braveheart*), who were positioned as the event's patrons. The affiliation with these two Academy Award winners not only gave the event prestige and legitimacy within the film industry but also contributed to the identity of the event as a fantasy film festival, and would prove to be vital connections in the formation of extra-curricular events such as make-up workshops and panel discussions which ultimately contributed to the *participation-based incentives* of GCFF in the years to come.

Additionally, consideration was given to the actual name of the event. That is, the term *film festival* was deliberately left out of the official title to avoid the event from being seen as “too arty” [sic] by the Gold Coast community (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 10). The title *Gold Coast Film Fantastic* also prevented the event from being overly-scrutinised by the film industry, which, as an un-named Australian distributor warned “if it [GCFF] is out and out commercial, you will not get international respect” due to those mainstream films which would likely make up the majority of the program (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 10).

Strategic, importation-based decisions were similarly made regarding the *timing* of the event. It was noted that GCFF should avoid any calendrical conflict caused by operating at the same time as the Brisbane International Film Festival, the closest geographical film festival, located 80 km north of the Gold Coast, due to a potential “difficulty to obtain product” (Globe Entertainment, 2001, p. 10). Additional date-based factors included the weather and the conflicts/benefits of operating at the same time as other community events such as the Indy 300 car race or the Australian International Movie Convention.

In fact the only operational oversight made by GCFF board members during its first cycle was the failure to appoint an individual to co-ordinate the event. That is, rather than hiring a festival or artistic director the event was managed and physically operated by a public relations firm. This oversight would be rectified in 2002, however only partly, as GCFF board members selected an individual with a PR background as opposed to employing a film festival professional to physically manage the event.

The selection of both the PR firm in 2001 and the PR individual in 2002 was not perceived as a damaging decision at the time due to the fact GCFF ran smoothly, attracted media attention and re-energised its funding requirements thereby ensuring the financial stability of the event. However, the situation began to bear some significance when in 2003

the third consecutive PR individual was appointed as festival director. While hiring an individual with a PR background does have its advantages in the form of, for example a sponsorship-friendly presentational style, a media focus, etc., there were in this case a number of misunderstandings as to what the actual job entailed and the amount of work required, which discouraged all three previous directors from renewing their contract. As previously mentioned, there exists an assumed but erroneous mindset with regard to the position of film festival director that, in order to qualify, an individual need only “like” movies (Gilmore in Tanner, 2009, p. 136). It is not enough for an art gallery director to merely ‘like’ paintings, nor for the director of a symphony to be a music ‘fan’; these positions require professionals with deep understanding of their respective fields. The same is true of film festivals and the requirements of their directors.

The disorganising effect associated with operational turnover meant that with each new directorship appointment GCFF was losing valuable social connectivity among its resource providers. Thus, each operation represented a re-building rather than a continuation of operation. For example, important open system aspects such as *feedback* were not followed through because valuable information regarding resource provider perceptions of the festival was lost with every departure. In fact, for every operational cycle from 2002 to 2006 a new director was appointed. The only constant force in the operational structure of the event was the GCFF board, and it was becoming increasingly apparent that GCFF was not achieving its goal of becoming a ‘world class film industry event’ and that its viability was threatened.

Among the most noticeable shortfalls was the lack of attention paid to the proposed film market, though this component was slowly phased out as the event’s operation became more of a reality. Yet, other aspects of operation, such as film industry participation never seemed to stretch beyond that which was locally available; not a situation conducive to the creation of a highly attended or publicised world cinema event. On occasion the festival would secure the attendance of a prominent guest, such as film director Richard Franklin who took part in a retrospective of his work at the festival in 2003. But for the most part the event recruited the same individuals year-in and year-out to participate in variations of previous workshops and seminars. In a word the festival was stagnating.

A re-hashing of previous operational frameworks was most often the only perceived method of facilitating the event. Gilmore (in Tanner, 2009) notes that it is a “talented artistic director who usually makes the big difference for the festival having some ultimate degree of success, or even survival” (p. 136). GCFF was lacking this type of individual and subsequently suffered a continuing limiting of its importation-based, open system capabilities and was inadvertently contributing to its own entropy. Interestingly, the program remained remarkably strong and it is a credit to the event organisers, who routinely kept the number of films screened in the low twenties, that the festival managed to survive at all; any more titles could have proven even more logistically difficult and financially draining.

In 2006, the GCFF board successfully hired its first experienced festival director. This individual had a proven track record in facilitating a local, community-based short film festival as well as a national travelling film festival. The importation-based benefits of hiring this individual were immediate. Meetings were held with three major Australian distributors. These meetings were strategic in the sense that they established an interpersonal relationship between the film festival and its content suppliers. Whereas in the past, the GCFF festival director would generally communicate via e-mail or phone, the fact that the new festival director flew interstate specifically to meet each distributor, not only indicated the value the festival placed on their participation, but also enabled the director to address any concerns regarding operation immediately, and was thus able to deal with feedback that previously had been neglected. Additionally, the festival director made contact with a commercial cinema venue manager and was able to convince him to join the board. The addition of this new board member enabled GCFF to work more closely with the venue than it had previously and as a result the festival was able to gain venue hire at a reduced rate.

The new festival director also took on a more involved role with members of the film industry in order to enhance those participants’ experience of the festival. For example, themed, pre-film workshops such as sword fighting, animal training, and even professional wrestling, were held to increase the participation-based incentives of the event and expand the resource pool from which film industry professionals were drawn. An interesting result of these themed workshops was a wider selection of films from distributors, e.g., the southern hemisphere premiere of *Pan’s Labyrinth* (2006) was given to the film festival as

an opening night film due to the publicity-raising activities held in conjunction with its screening.

Additionally, the new festival director was able to use his personal experience and contacts to develop previously untried operational components such as new media activities, three-day young filmmaker workshops and a niche, Bollywood program. Not only did these components expand the cultural reach of the festival, but they also opened new importation streams for the event. The Indian population on the Gold Coast had never been approached as potential audience members and therefore constituted a new potential source of resource providers.

It is important to note that this first attempt to engage the Indian population was not wholly unsuccessful as the income from attendance did not fully counteract the financially-driven entropy of the event. However, the attempt to facilitate such an event was recognised by other resource providers, such as the Pacific Film and Television Commission, Queensland's screen cultural funding body, who saw the incorporation of this programming as an improvement upon the overall commercial program of previous years and provided much encouragement for its continuation.

With the appointment of the new festival director, then, the event appeared to have an individual better suited for the role. Yet unfortunately, upon the completion of the event the new festival director promptly resigned for personal reasons. This resignation had several detrimental effects on the operation of the festival. First and most importantly there was minimal *re-energisation* of the film festival environment as acquittal forms detailing the festival's performance were submitted late or not at all to the relevant funding organisations; follow-up acknowledgement of participation, in the form of recognition of service for patrons and special guests, was decidedly generic; and the 2006 Festival Report was lack-lustre and did not contain any empirical data such as audience attendance figures or economic impact statements of the event through which participants could *assess their level of gratification*. In short, the resigning of the new festival director resulted in the loss of all the open system advantages he had helped to facilitate and ultimately placed GCFF in a decidedly worse position.

Not surprisingly, following the 2006 edition the festival's board members elected to suspend operation. It is from this point that the author's role as the film festival director began. The following narrative discusses how this stagnant operational situation was

approached by the researcher in his role as director of the festival and the results of the application of those open system concepts identified in this thesis.

Initial attention was paid by the director to the various open system conditions identified as being crucial to the functioning of the festival in an attempt to discern what had brought about the festival's imminent demise and how the situation could be rectified. This was to be the putting into practice of a theoretical approach to festival organisation that the director, as a film festival researcher, had been formulating for quite some time.

Open system condition 1 – Failure to re-energise

As previously mentioned GCFF had an operational history of failing to fully re-energise its environment and the resource providers it contained, due to the lack of film festival director continuity. In 2006, however, unlike previous cycles in which resource providers were at least satisfied with the outcome of participation, the festival left many of those resource providers questioning the benefits of their involvement all together; the most serious example being a rejected acquittal submission to the Australian Film Commission (AFC) which disqualified GCFF from any future funding opportunities.

Similar problems were faced with regard to Warner Roadshow Studios, which had annually contributed funding to facilitate a new filmmaker competition. This important sponsor – crucially important in light of the festival's identifiable function as the facilitator of a movie industry on the Gold Coast – was de-motivated to participate in any further GCFF activities due to a range of issues, including logistical problems regarding the screening of films at the competition, and the perceived 'ingratitude' of GCFF organisers who seemed to take the sponsorship for granted.

Open system condition 2 – Loss of participation

Participation-based challenges also became apparent. Over the course of five operational cycles, individuals from the local film industry had become increasingly disillusioned as to their perceived role within the event's structure. They viewed their participation as being completely one-sided in the festival's favour and the prevailing perception of the event was that its organisers only seemed to acknowledge the local film industry when they required its services.

Additional participation-based problems arose internally when three key board members resigned. The loss of these members presented further challenges as each

individual occupied decidedly strategic positions; one was a lawyer, another an accountant and the third the recently recruited commercial cinema venue manager. The departure of the venue manager was especially disruptive as it meant a new venue would need to be sourced. It became apparent that unless this situation was addressed the festival would encounter additional interconnected financially-driven entropy, as other Gold Coast venues did not share much enthusiasm for the event and would not consider a reduced venue hire rate.

Open system condition 3 – Need to re-design operational structure

The festival's history of failing to re-energise the environment meant new funding sources would need to be sought. It also indicated that the perceived legitimacy of GCFF would require consideration when approaching particular resource providers who may be reluctant to participate due to their past GCFF experiences. There was then, the need for GCFF to modify its operational structure to better address these existing limitations.

Considerations would also have to be taken of the sprawling geographical nature of the Gold Coast and its population. Since 2002 the population of the city had increased from 370,585 (Gold Coast HSD, 2003) to over 497,000 in 2007, thus making it one of the "fastest growing areas in Australia" (ABC, 2007, para. 12). The realisation of such environmental conditions indicated a need for the festival to occupy a physical location that provided ease of access from the farther reaches of the area and/or consider a mobile aspect to the festival.

Open system condition 4 – Stored resources

Not all the open system conditions existing were to the detriment of the film festival. The decision to suspend the operation of GCFF ultimately slowed entropy. It is important to note that entropy could not be completely stopped as minor fees such as website registration and other administrative costs still occurred during the suspended operation. However, the ceasing of operation enabled GCFF organisers to control the degree to which entropy affected the festival and allowed for a rebuilding from an existing foundation rather than the institution of a wholly new event.

The suspended operation allowed GCFF organisers to store those secured resources for later use, which meant the GCFF had AUD\$25,000 of undedicated funding available which could be used for later re-operation. The existence of this funding was a major

benefit as it provided GCFF organisers with a resource that could be relied upon until new financial resources could be secured.

2008 proposed model of operation

Having assessed the open system conditions for signs of a potential re-activation, a new operational model was placed before the board. This proposed model indicated a new direction in terms of the focus of GCFF while simultaneously setting expanded parameters for resource provider interaction. The ideas and concepts presented in this model would later provide the basis for a funding submission to the Gold Coast City Council, the result of which would serve to re-activate both the *financial* and *participation-based importation streams* of the festival.

The proposed operational model saw GCFF structured around four key functions. These functions served two strategic purposes: first, they were designed to broaden the potential resource provider catchment by focusing less on the film industry and more on Gold Coast community involvement; second, the identification of a new functional role for the film festival effectively re-positioned the social expectations of the event so that the realignment could potentially provide the event with an opportunity to re-engage resource providers such as the AFC and Warner Roadshow Studios.

Each of these functions will now be discussed in detail.

Function 1: To provide entertainment to the Gold Coast community through sports-themed, fantasy-based or locally produced feature films.

This function presented the most noticeable change to the operational structure in that it directly impacted upon the programming of the festival. It is interesting to note that the programming juxtaposition of screening sports and fantasy films was not necessarily new to GCFF. Films with such a hybrid theme had been screened by the festival before: *Ong-bak* (2003), screened at GCFF in 2003, and *Shaolin Soccer* (2001) which featured in GCFF in 2004, had both incorporated fantasy and sports themes. However, this would be the first time GCFF dedicated a specific film type other than fantasy to the primary program.

The rationale behind changing the program was as follows. First, the incorporation of sports films was identified as a means of diversifying and expanding both audience and sponsorship importation streams; sports being a particularly strong pre-occupation of the

Australian and Gold Coast psyche. The previous five cycles of operation had developed a dedicated audience base; however it was a fraction of the overall available Gold Coast population. Therefore in order to address, and potentially secure, the participation of a greater proportion of this population, a theme congruent with the sporting culture of the Gold Coast was incorporated.

Evidence of the entrenched nature of sports on the Gold Coast was observed both in recreational activities, e.g., surfing, bike riding, etc., and in those official sporting competitions held annually in the region, such as the ANZ Ladies Master Golf, the Pan Pacific Masters Games, the Gold Coast Airport Marathon, the Indy 300 and the Conrad Jupiter's Magic Millions Carnival. In addition to these pre-existing sporting events, in 2007 two professional sports teams also began operation on the Gold Coast. The Gold Coast Titans, a Rugby League team, and the Gold Coast Blaze from the National Basketball League, commenced at the same time GCFF was in pre-planning.

The sporting theme also presented the possibility of a viable income stream for sponsorship. New sponsors needed to be enlisted because previous GCFF editions had exhausted the supply of fantasy/film industry-based businesses, thus leaving few if any, new areas for funding-based development. According to a 2006 Gold Coast Business Survey (GCCC, 2006) “[j]ust under ninety percent (88.9%) of [sports-related] businesses had their head offices in the Gold Coast City area” (p. 1). This information was important not only because it indicated there was an established sports industry presence, but also allowed for ease of contact and provided an advantage in terms of presenting sponsorship as ‘supporting’ a community organisation.

The decision to retain fantasy films within the program was due to the existing infrastructure of the event. Given the compressed time frame for *re-energisation* and the unknown quantity of funding supply it would have cost more money to completely re-brand the event than to simply expand its programming categories. Additionally, as previously mentioned there was an established, though small, audience base specifically interested in the fantasy films programmed into GCFF. It was therefore deemed more advantageous, from an open system perspective, to retain these audience members and attempt to augment their numbers than to close off any participation in a year of such uncertainty.

The addition of local feature films was designed to take advantage of a growing number of Gold Coast-based filmmakers. The director had been made aware of the availability of local feature films through personal academic connections. The incorporation of these local features was seen as a means re-energising and legitimising GCFF's connection to the Gold Coast film industry. The screening of these local films also presented a unique opportunity to secure the participation of additional audience members. That is, given the film festival would be held in a movie theatre many of the people involved in the local productions could be motivated to attend the screening given the rare opportunity to view the work outside of normal consumer televisions and projector systems.

Function 2: To involve the Gold Coast filmmaking community in competition and skill building activities through new media.

The intention to include a competition for local filmmakers was seen as having the potential to engage the local community. The previously mentioned Interim Report had not discussed the need to secure a broad range of participants, which resulted in the event being essentially dependent upon the film industry for both *operations* and *participant-based resources*. The re-focusing of GCFF to include local filmmakers through direct interaction was viewed as a simple yet effective means of diversifying the participation base of the event.

It is important to note that competitions had previously been held as part of GCFF, but that these were generally viewed by the organisers as secondary to the actual film festival. Such a view had, in fact been responsible for Warner Roadshow Studios' withdrawal of funding. Similarly, skill building activities also existed, yet these too did not have the same perceived importance and thus lacked attendance and prestige.

The rationale for including such activities into the festival can be seen as a precursor to the importation strategy of resource control. That is, through the effective use of competitions and skill building activities a film festival may familiarise potential, future resource providers with the event. This future participation includes but is not limited to their interaction as: audience members, filmmakers, sponsors or volunteers.

Function 3: To create an environment in which the youth of the Gold Coast are able to participate in numerous activities involving new media and sports

The ultimate purpose of this function was to enable GCFF to engage with educational, social and other youth-based organisations. This function can be seen to facilitate co-operative alliances with community groups/school that could potentially integrate the event into their own film/artistic curricula. Additionally, the partnering of GCFF with youth-based organisations would potentially allow the film festival to apply for government funding, thus opening new revenue streams. Similarly, the involvement of youth-based groups was viewed as a means of re-approaching previously de-motivated participants. By securing a youth-based demographic, local sponsors such as Wet 'n' Wild Water Park and Warner Bros. Movie World might be more open to interaction.

It was also envisioned that should GCFF procure the equipment required to facilitate outdoor screenings so that various playing fields and or school areas could be used as venues. The utilisation of these outdoor venues would help to solve the logistical problems of the Gold Coast's urban sprawl, would address the issues of acquiring a venue in general, and additionally would serve to reinforce the community-based nature of the festival.

Function 4: To introduce new audiences to film culture

This cultural mandate had always been a part of GCFF operational structure though it was never clearly communicated. Given the original aversion to appearing 'too arty' by adopting the title of 'Film Festival', such a 'masking' of GCFF's cultural ambitions can be seen as an attempt to avoid dissuading audience members from attending because it would be considered too 'cultural'. Regardless of the reasons, it was deemed appropriate to follow this line of approach, especially in view of the aforementioned *co-operative alliances* forged with schools and other community groups.

Given the current open system characteristics, the overt recognition of GCFF as a cultural event was also seen as an important characteristic that needed to be highlighted when applying to government funding bodies. Ironically, the introduction of Gold Coast audiences to film culture would not mean a drastic change to the program. In fact, a number of films previously programmed at GCFF were foreign films bought by Australian distributors. Therefore these films were subtitled and had cultural value in that they would most likely have otherwise received limited theatrical screening. Thus, the exercising of

this function only served to clearly communicate what previous film festival organisers were, for whatever reasons, reluctant to announce or admit to.

Strategies utilised

Having identified those areas of festival operation that required addressing in order to get the festival up and running again, and having also provided the festival's board with an assessment of the festivals 'place' in the environment, it now became incumbent on the director to put into practice those strategies deemed necessary to re-energise the festival's environment and commence its operation. The following section will identify and discuss the open system importation-based strategies implemented by the festival director in order to re-activate the Gold Coast Film Fantastic festival.

Co-operative alliances

The strategy of building co-operative alliances proved to be instrumental in enabling the festival director to position GCFF so as to have access to a larger, more diverse group of resource providers. As previously mentioned, new importation streams were required to replace those resource providers no longer willing to collaborate due to the unfortunate nature of their past experiences. To this end, a total of six co-operative alliances were formed with various community groups, local government initiatives and non-profit organisations.

The following identifies each of the six alliances and briefly discusses the strategic benefits of each partnership; the formation of these alliances and the resulting shared activities and events which took place during a ten-month period in the lead up to the actual operation of the film festival. It is important to note that the presentational order of these alliances is not indicative of a hierarchy, since each alliance was equally important in establishing and strengthening the social connectivity of GCFF.

Active and Healthy Gold Coast (AHGC) is a local government, exercise-based program aimed at promoting active lifestyles among members of the Gold Coast community. The co-operative alliance formed with AHGC was connected to the functional roles of GCFF as an exhibitor of sports films and as a facilitator of youth-based activities involving new media and sports. The importation-based benefits of aligning AHGC ranged from publicity (both printed and virtual) of GCFF community activities, to demonstrating the versatility and importance GCFF could play within the social network of the Gold

Coast community. That is, the alliance between AHGC and GCFF would broaden the community impact of the event beyond that of being viewed as *just* a film festival.

Broadbeach Alliance (BA) is organisation that facilitates entertainment within the Gold Coast suburb of Broadbeach. Its primary function is to “create and manage world class events” (Broadbeach Alliance, 2008, para. 1) with the expressed purpose of attracting people to the suburb for the benefit of local businesses. The co-operative alliance formed with BA consisted of a free, public screening of the surfing film *Endless Summer* (1966).

This screening was held two weeks prior to the actual festival and thus enabled the festival director to raise the awareness level of the upcoming film festival via onscreen advertising, media coverage and flyer handouts. This co-operative alliance also enabled GCFF to gain access to a new audience demographic: due to the outdoor and admission-free nature of the screening, audience members in the form of families with young children, who otherwise may not participate in the festival, were provided with an opportunity to interact with, and so contribute to the overall community impact of the film festival. Additionally, the facilitation of this outdoor screening was important in validating the effective use of funding allocated to GCFF to purchase an outdoor cinema. This topic will be revisited in the section dealing with the strategy of legitimising affiliations.

Gold Coast Music Industry Association (GCMIA) is an organisation that facilitates “local festivals, music conferences and workshops, and development initiatives” (GCMIA, 2009, para. 3) to its membership of Gold Coast-based musicians. The co-operative alliance formed with GCMIA was initiated by the Gold Coast City Council in an effort to increase the interaction between community organisations. This alliance benefited GCFF by presenting new opportunities to cross-publicise festival events via established e-mail channels. Additionally, the film festival was able to utilise music supplied by GCMIA members as part of its pre-show entertainment. Prior to each screening, a digital slideshow would announce upcoming films and GCFF activities. The background music of these slideshows featured the songs and contact details of these local musicians. The use of this music not only provided GCFF with royalty-free music tracks but also increased the audience size as the musicians and their families and friends often attended screenings to hear their songs played.

Gold Coast Bazaar (GCB) was an annual “celebration of fashion, food and fun” (Drew, 2009, para. 1) hosted by Gold Coast Tourism. The month-long ‘celebration’ was

held during June and presented an opportunity for GCFF to raise its profile among the Gold Coast community and co-ordinate the first ‘Fantastic Sneak Peek’ (FSP).

The ‘Fantastic Sneak Peek’ was a one-off, pre-release screening of a commercial film. The GCB provided the ideal platform to launch this project as the infrastructure, e.g., the media, websites, press releases, etc. was provided by the organisation free of charge. In order to take full advantage of this opportunity the festival director secured the Australian premiere of *The Ruins* (2008) which was filmed on the Gold Coast using the local film industry. Thus, through this co-operative alliance, GCFF was able to successfully introduce and test the participant acceptance of the ‘Fantastic Sneak Peek’ concept with very little possibility of financial or participation-driven entropy. Similarly, the fact that the film screened had the involvement of the local film industry meant the festival director could contact those individuals previously disillusioned with GCFF and invite them as guests to the event. The result of this was a re-energisation of particular film industry members and the promise of further future interaction.

Riding for the Disabled Association (RDA) is “a voluntary, nonprofit organisation which provides opportunities for anyone with a disability to enjoy safe, healthy, stimulating, therapeutic, horse-related activities in Australia” (RDA, 2009, para. 1). The co-operative alliance between RDA and GCFF was based upon an interactive media project facilitated by the film festival titled ‘Possibilities’.

The benefits of having RDA as a partner were, at the very least, three-fold: first, the alliance enabled GCFF to apply for Festivals Australia funding as that Federal Government agency stipulated that money would only be allocated to those projects involving disadvantaged community members (Festivals Australia, 2009); second, RDA represented a new demographic of participants, both through the involvement of the RDA organisers in the project and the attendance of audience members at the live performance that was scheduled as part of ‘Possibilities’. Third, RDA validated the functional role of GCFF as a facilitator of activities involving youth and new media. That such an alliance also served as a socially responsible example of good citizenship was the proverbial icing on the cake.

SISCO is an arts-based youth organisation located on the Gold Coast. The co-operative alliance with SISCO presented the film festival director with an opportunity to publicise GCFF to schools and interested students via the SISCO network. The benefit of this partnership was the ‘insider’ access afforded to GCFF to raise awareness of the film

festival. Additionally, the festival director, as an academic, was able to present information about the festival to SISCO participants on an educative basis, thus enabling feedback on proposed ideas regarding film competitions and new media opportunities.

Date placement

The dates for GFCC 2008 were October 16th-20th. These particular dates were chosen for three strategic reasons. First, the holding of the event in October provided the film festival director with a ten-month period in which to establish new, and to re-activate previous, importation streams into the festival. So, for example, the director began implementing strategies such as the co-operative alliances outlined above in January in order to be eligible for funding opportunities spanning from February to July. Funding programs after July could not be applied for due to the time needed to assess and process applications, thus after that date the only potential income would originate from private sponsorship. Additionally, this ten-month timeframe permitted the film festival organisers to facilitate projects designed to raise the awareness and re-establish the reputation of the festival through initiatives such as Fantastic Sneak Peeks.

Second, the month of October positioned GCFF at an opportune time with regard to the Australian distributor patterns. That is, the festival director was able to select titles that would be set for release during the December holidays, thus enabling GCFF to have access to a broad range of programming. Additionally, the Australian International Movie Convention was to be held one month prior to GCFF and so the festival director was able to preview and negotiate an appropriate opening night film, that being the Australian premiere for *Ghost Town* (2008).

The third reason for the date placement was to ensure that the commencement of the festival did not conflict with any other community events. The placement of GCFF positioned the event two weeks after school holidays and one week prior to both the Indy 300 and the Rugby League World Cup. This date placement meant the film festival would have increased access to a choice of venues as the festival would not conflict with a known 'busy' box office period for Gold Coast cinemas. Similarly, the scheduling of the event prior to the major sporting events enabled GCFF to take advantage of the heightened sports atmosphere which would consequently raise awareness of the festival.

Geographic location

The Gold Coast is a tourist destination. At the time of GCFF 2008, a total of 9.6 million tourists had visited the region that year alone (Gold Coast Tourism, 2009, line. 11). Additionally, the Gold Coast is located far enough from Brisbane to enable both GCFF and the Brisbane International Film Festival to operate with very little audience overlap. As a consequence, there was very little, in terms of its location, that the festival director could do to enhance the attractiveness of the event given its current physical environment.

The festival director did, however, make a strategic decision to hold GCFF at the Birch Carroll and Coyle cinema located at the Pacific Fair Shopping Centre. As previously mentioned the Gold Coast is a sprawling city, yet, the positioning of the festival at this particular location gave the event a sense of lying at the city's heart. Pacific Fair is considered the "premier shopping centre" in the region and is "one of the largest in Australia" (Gold Coast, 2009, para. 1). The shopping centre is located along the Gold Coast Highway and also features the main public transport interchange for the southern Gold Coast.

The cinema itself offered a large foyer in which displays and GCFF signage could be posted. Similarly, the theatres utilised by GCFF were modestly-sized at just over 200 seats and thus allowed for mid-sized audiences to attend the screenings. Finally, the cinema's position within the Pacific Fair shopping centre meant volunteers could easily 'walk the mall' handing out programs so increasing the total audience potential.

Identifiable function

It was previously mentioned that in assessing the open system conditions inherent to the re-activation of GCFF the film festival director introduced four functions that would be used to guide operation. These functions were:

- to provide entertainment to the Gold Coast community through films that are sports-themed, fantasy-based or locally produced feature films;
- to involve the Gold Coast filmmaking community in competition and skill building activities through new media;
- to create an environment in which the youth of the Gold Coast are able to participate in numerous activities involving new media and sports; and
- to introduce new audiences to film culture.

These functions were clearly communicated on GCFF sponsorship material, in public funding applications, and at public speaking engagements. The aim of announcing the festival's intentions was twofold. The identification of these functions was, first, an attempt to frame resource provider perspectives of the event. That is, by defining the function of GCFF the festival organiser was able to reduce ambiguity as to the intentions and purpose of the event, most of which, ironically, given the previous recounting of the festival's origins, stemmed from the actual title *Gold Coast Film Fantastic*, which, as designed, does not indicate the event is a film festival. Therefore, through the strategy of identifiable function the festival director was able to engage with potential resource providers in an effective and efficient manner.

The second purpose served by establishing the roles of GCFF was the resultant declaration of the functional territory the event would occupy. That is, in order to ensure that GCFF would have first option to import film-related resources, e.g., locally produced films, the event needed to be seen as an authority. The ultimate goal was to develop a reverse dependency situation where film production was tied to the running of the festival so that GCFF would be afforded more control over resources, which would in turn contribute to stable and continuous operation.

This strategy was also instrumental in the re-positioning of the festival as a Gold Coast community event. As previously mentioned, GCFF encountered a single source dependency, an open system dilemma that resulted from exclusively focusing on film industry participation. Although the film industry was not completely removed from this festival's mandate it was felt that the new reduced role of the film industry within the event was much more realistic given the obvious lower hierarchical status of GCFF in comparison to other Australian film festivals.

Legitimising affiliations

The GCFF festival director utilised existing legitimising affiliations as well as developing new relationships in order to promote resource importation into the festival. The affiliations proved particularly useful in demonstrating the validity of GCFF as a film festival and also served to confirm its standing within the Gold Coast community. In fact, once the film festival had attained a certain number of affiliations it then became almost mandatory for certain resource providers to participate, simply because they did not want to risk the consequences of being left out.

The following identifies and discusses the legitimising affiliations used by the festival director to leverage the GCFF so as to potentially increase the motivation for resource importation. The affiliations are presented according to those groups identified and discussed in Chapter Four.

Organiser-based affiliation

The GCFF festival director was able to utilise his personal contacts in order to secure the participation of festival guests, volunteers, filmmakers and audience members. Though seen as a last resort, these personal affiliations were the most taxing in terms of time expenditure since great effort must be made to prevent the personal contact from being lost should unforeseen problems arise.

The majority of personal contacts stemmed from the festival's director previous position as a university senior teaching fellow. The contacts from this position included past and present film students interested in becoming involved in the event. Additional contacts were drawn from the festival director's experience as a film director in Europe. These latter contacts were instrumental in securing the participation of highly sought after individuals to participate in the event.

The festival director was also able to rely upon his previous experience to know exactly what was needed to facilitate a film festival. Those event management skills specifically tailored to film festival operation had been developed through years of involvement with, and direction of, similar events. Because of such experience the director's cognisance of the importance of the timeliness of resource provider interaction; his ability to read and react to the environment; and his general understanding of how film festivals operate played crucial roles in the re-activation of GCFF. The director made a point, for example, of contacting the local media early into his directorship and keeping its members abreast of upcoming events and activities such as 'Fantastic Sneak Peeks'. The rationale behind this action was to be able to continually remind these particular resource providers of the film festival so as to encourage publicity and build a year-round presence.

Organisation-based affiliation

Though GCFF did not originate from a pre-existing organisation, the re-activation of the festival saw the event marketed to select resource providers as being an affiliate of the recently formed Film Gold Coast, the screen production branch of the Gold Cost City

Council's Economic Development and Major Projects Directorate. The positioning of GCFF as a Film Gold Coast initiative transpired because Film Gold Coast executives saw the potential of being credited with the re-introduction of the festival within a few months of service.

The festival director agreed to such positioning because the affiliation aligned the event with the authoritative, government body in the region. Additionally, Film Gold Coast had a steering committee made up individuals from the local film industry, including the vice president of Studio Operations of Warner Roadshow Studios. Through this affiliation, the GCFF was able to initiate interaction with previous resource providers thereby further increasing the likelihood of their future participation. In addition to this he was able to utilise Film Gold Coast's electronic mailing list and its website to promote festival activities thus effectively expanding the potential audience base.

Patron/official guest-based affiliation

As previously mentioned John Cox was the official patron of GCFF. He agreed to continue this affiliation although Peter Frampton had withdrawn his support of the event after 2005. The patronage of Cox was particularly useful with regard to the opportunity for media exposure and for the letters of endorsement he provided which were regularly included in funding submissions. Similarly, Cox's involvement was crucial when the festival director began lobbying the European Fantastic Film Festivals Federation for membership. His status as patron was used to verify the importance of the festival as a festival, and consequently enabled GCFF to submit an application for accreditation. This is a topic that will be discussed further in the section on the strategy of utilising sanctioning organisations.

Seven guest filmmakers were also drawn into the mix. Among the most notable were Dana and Wes Brown, the celebrated surf filmmakers who directed and produced *Step into Liquid* (2003). The Browns' involvement was critical in legitimising the sports-themed function of the film festival.

The Browns were selected as potential guests for the following reasons. First, they are highly regarded filmmakers with international appeal. Additionally, their family ties to the industry – Dana's father is Bruce Brown, director of the seminal surf film *Endless Summer* – were viewed as having the potential to attract media participation. Second, the

festival director knew it would be difficult to secure the participation of a drama-based director, as there was very little incentive for such an individual to attend the film festival. However, the Browns are avid surfers, had never visited the Gold Coast, and had just finished post-production on their latest feature film, *Highwater* (2008). Thus, there was leverage to motivate their participation on a personal level and to secure their attendance for an extended amount of time because their involvement was seen by them as a vacation.

This recreational aspect of the Browns' involvement meant that the GCFF could use their participation in the lead-up to the actual festival. In fact, in the two weeks prior to the actual film festival they were involved in a number of audience-focused, participation-based incentives, including a question and answer session at the Broadbeach Alliance co-sponsored outdoor screening of *Endless Summer*. Similarly, they juried a 'Surfing – Show 'n' Tell' competition, an initiative which saw young surf filmmakers screen their films and receive critical feedback from the Browns, who also conducted masterclasses at Gold Coast-based secondary schools and higher education institutions. Each of these pre-festival events was used to raise the awareness of GCFF within the Gold Coast community with the goal of motivating audience participation; given the participation of these two individuals it would have been difficult to refute GCFF's legitimacy.

Other festival guests included two first-time feature filmmakers from Norway, a second-time feature film director from England and three Gold Coast-based filmmakers. All of these participants contributed to the incentives to become involved with GCFF events as such attendance presented rare opportunities for interaction in a shared professional environment. Interestingly, the involvement of the English director was arranged in collaboration with Film Gold Coast after he had contacted the film body regarding shooting his third feature film on the Gold Coast. Arrangements were therefore made for him to participate in the film festival while conducting pre-production on that film. Thus, GCFF was inadvertently able to fulfil a role similar to that originally planned for the festival in promoting the area as a filmmaking centre.

Board of directors-based affiliation

The departure of three board members upon the conclusion of GCFF 2006 meant that the film festival organisers would need to recruit additional members. The festival director selected two individuals who were to prove instrumental in the operation of the event. The first was a lawyer whose provision of legal services at no cost helped reduce

financial-driven entropy. The second was a make-up artist who provided valuable services in the form of, for example facilitating a make-up workshop as a means of attracting the participation of those interested in a career in theatrical/film make-up.

Additional benefits provided by the board members proceeded from their personal affiliations with highly respected individuals who could provide legitimacy to the event when it came to applying for funding. Among the most important of these was a university film professor whose experience with previous film festivals proved critical in strategically planning and lobbying GCFF's position so as to present the festival in the strongest possible light.

Sponsor-based affiliation

The festival benefited from a number of sponsorship-based affiliations. These affiliations were important first and foremost because they represented active importation of funding and in-kind services. Sponsorship is a direct indicator of external involvement and so the participation of sponsors is generally a good indicator of a functioning open system. These affiliations also contribute to the prestige of an event; higher profile sponsors can be seen to afford a film festival more legitimacy as a business concern, which is, in turn, conducive to the motivation of additional participation.

The GCFF director identified a number of key, strategic sponsors to pursue in order to increase resource importation. Not all sponsors were engaged at once; rather the festival director made conscious decisions as to when to contact each individual sponsor so as to present GCFF as a strong candidate for funding.

Gold Coast City Council (GCCC) was the first sponsor approached by GCFF and its participation was viewed as critical. It was decided by the board early on that should GCFF not have secured GCCC sponsorship the festival would be officially disbanded. The importance placed upon this sponsorship was based on GCCC's position as the governmental authority in the region. Because of its troubled past and unfortunate reputation a GCFF affiliation with GCCC would be absolutely necessary in order for the festival to open several crucial importation pathways including those with community organisations such as the Broadbeach Alliance and Gold Coast Music Industry Association. Similarly, a number of Federal Government grants require Local Government support via information about financial contributions or formal letters of recognition.

Once GCCC sponsorship was confirmed the film festival organiser was then able to approach a series of second-tier government sponsors. These included the Community Gambling Benefit Fund at the State level, and Festivals Australia at the Federal level. It is important to note that referring to these sponsors as second-tier does not mean they were any less valuable to the festival than GCCC but only demonstrates their overall approachability given the open system conditions GCFF faced at the time.

Community Gambling Benefit Fund (CGBF) is a Queensland State Government initiative that was identified by the festival director as being a likely source of funding for an outdoor cinema project entitled ‘Mobile Screen Fantastic’. The proposal presented to the Fund identified the community importance of an outdoor cinema in both facilitating year-round film culture and providing entertainment to those community members, such as young families, not likely to attend indoor cinema screenings. Similarly, the appropriateness of the mobile outdoor screen was touted in regard to the sprawling dimensions of the Gold Coast. As an added incentive for funding, the festival director noted the variety of uses an outdoor cinema could have when used in co-operation with other community groups when the festival was not in progress.

Once CGBF sponsorship was confirmed the director then began to form strategic co-operative alliances with other community groups to further expand the importation capabilities of the film festival. The ownership of a mobile cinema made GCFF more attractive to private sponsors, who could now benefit from access to the community aspect of outdoor films, as well as the extended year-round screenings the cinema could facilitate.

Festivals Australia (FA) is “an Australian Government program which funds Australian regional and community festivals to present quality cultural projects” (Festivals Australia, 2009, para. 1). This grant carried the stipulation that to qualify for funding the applying organisation needed to be located in a regional area or involve disadvantaged community members, a requirement fulfilled by the co-operative alliance with Riding for the Disabled.

The previously mentioned ‘Possibilities’ project which involved Riding for the Disabled was designed as a live action, multi-screen event and featured the talents of two visiting Dutch filmmakers. It is interesting to note the Festivals Australia grant is notoriously difficult to obtain due to the various strict, eligibility requirements. The funding body does not, for example, accept re-applications so in order to be considered

“eligible for funding, an activity must not have been previously presented” (Festivals Australia, 2009, para. 2). Similarly, the FA only accepts applications twice a year, so those applying must carefully plan a submission months in advance in order to receive funding in time. When applying for this grant one must be extremely cautious to present the best argument for funding possible.

The FA was selected as a possible sponsor due to the prestige associated with successful project selection in addition to the fact that the funding supplied would be adequate to cover the majority of the costs of ‘Possibilities’ consequently enabling the festival director to introduce a new type of programming event with very little financially-driven entropy.

Once FA sponsorship was confirmed the director then approached the Dutch consulate in Canberra. Upon learning of the Festival Australia support, the consulate immediately agreed to also participate and provided additional funding to cover the costs of the Dutch filmmakers airfares and accommodation.

The **Pacific Film and Television Commission (PFTC)** was applied to last. Although the festival director had good relations with the funding body there were pre-existing problems that threatened potential sponsorship. In 2006 the outgoing festival director had neglected to submit an acquittal form and even though, upon learning of this matter, the remaining GCFF organisers had submitted the form there was much anticipation as to the likelihood of support given this unprofessional mismanagement of an important document.

It was a strategy of the festival director to indicate to the PFTC the support that the re-energised GCFF had now been able to muster. So only when funding from Festivals Australia, the Community Gambling Benefit Fund, the Dutch Government and Gold Coast City Council was confirmed did GCFF present a submission. This was a successful ploy and funding from PFTC was granted.

The festival also undertook to engage a number of private sponsors, including a Gold Coast-based Brewery, a local law firm and a commercial printer. The participation of these private businesses helped the festival through in-kind services and some minor financial contributions. Although the majority of sponsor-based affiliations derived from government funding bodies, the director was mindful of the need to avoid single source

dependencies. So, with the exception of the GCCC and PFTC grants all other government funding was dedicated to projects that were external to the festival's core function of screening films. These external projects were aimed at facilitating community-based activities and it was therefore calculated that if funding were to be withdrawn, or not secured in the first place, the primary operation of the festival would not have been threatened.

Participation-based incentives

The participation-based incentives of GCFF ranged from the provision of specialised programming for audience members to the sponsorship of 'Mobile Screen Fantastic' and the potential year-round exposure at all outdoor GCFF events it offered. Additional gratification was offered through low ticket prices – five dollars less than a standard movie ticket – as well as interaction with established filmmakers and skill building workshops which were offered free of charge.

In order to build the value of participation the director purposefully framed interaction as a unique experience. The challenge of implementing this strategy was that GCFF was slowly gaining an authoritative reputation within the local film industry, but until it was able to complete its first cycle of re-activation its position would be viewed with some trepidation. Therefore, the media was employed as much as possible to create within the Gold Coast community the impression that the film festival was thriving and that participation, while always welcome, would become more selective in the future.

The ever-present dilemma in this situation lies in keeping all the resource providers motivated even though those motivations for participation can often conflict. One of the private sponsors, for example, required a ten-second advertisement be played at least six times in the pre-screening slideshow. While this stipulation was not out of the question it did serve as an irritant to audience members who grew tired of seeing the same ad repeated so many times. Such is the complexity of the minutiae of operation, and it poses one of the most challenging aspects of maintaining a functioning OSM of film festival operation. This topic will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter.

Resource control

This strategy was not as viable as other importation-based strategies due to the open system conditions encountered during re-activation. The viability of GCFF was still unknown and would remain so until the event had completed its first operational cycle.

Resource control is an aspect of film festival operation that can only be strengthened through repeated successful operation. Even so, the director was still able to exert some influence over resources. For example, the ‘Surfing – Show ’n’ Tell’ project saw films entered into the film festival specifically because the Browns were critiquing the submissions. By manipulating the authority of the Browns, the festival director was able to influence the importation of a certain type of resource into the festival.

Interestingly, the festival director was able to exercise a form of resource control over the Browns. As part of the agreement for their involvement the two filmmakers provided GCFF with a previously unseen, twenty minute edit of their latest film *Highwater*. Additional resource control was seen to develop with the acquisition of the portable outdoor cinema. The ownership of this equipment meant that the film festival organisers could facilitate a screening with only basic logistical considerations, e.g., power, space, etc. Thus GCFF would no longer be dependent upon commercial theaters as its only means of facilitating a screening.

Sanctioning organisations

Two sanctioning organisations were identified by the festival director as being able to provide greater access to a particular type of resource. The challenge of gaining any affiliation with sanctioning organisations is that ultimately they must select the festival themselves. That is, a particular film festival must fit into the sanctioning organisation’s overall schema and so an application process to evaluate possible candidates must be negotiated.

Sports Business Taskforce (SBT) is “an industry-based body that undertakes promotion, marketing and networking to attract sports business to Gold Coast City” which aims to promote its vision that the city “be a premier sports destination and world-class supplier of sport goods and services” (BusinessGC, 2009, para. 1). The festival director saw SBT as a sanctioning organisation whose affiliation would be important to helping GCFF establish and promote its sports film theme. As previously mentioned, nearly 80 percent of sporting businesses on the Gold Coast have their head offices locally situated, so the sanctioning of the SBT was seen as a valuable means of gaining both legitimacy and access to that particular market. In fact, GCFF was able to screen trailers of upcoming films programmed into the festival at the SBT quarterly meetings. Entry into SBT was brokered through the Gold Coast City Council and the festival director was subject to an

interview and, once accepted, an application fee. It was through SBT that GCFF was able to first make contact with a minor sponsor in the form of the Burleigh Brewing Company. This sponsor's CEO was also a member of SBT and saw a congruency between her goals for the company and the identifiable function of GCFF as a community-based organisation.

European Fantastic Film Festivals Federation (EFFF) is a film festival sanctioning body. It represents over twenty festivals in Europe, Asia and North America and claims that with

a joint audience of approximately 600,000 spectators, the European Fantastic Films Federation has become one of the most powerful tools to promote the originality and creativity of the European fantasy film industry. (Melies, 2009, para. 1)

The GCFF director decided to contact EFFF regarding membership so as to help develop additional programming channels in addition to those presented by Australian distributors. Equally as enticing was the opportunity of being affiliated with a number of important fantasy-based film festivals, such as the *Brussels International Fantastic Film Festival*¹⁹, the Puchon International Fantastic Film Festival, and the Canadian-based *Fantasia International Film Festival*.

The rationale for membership to EFFF was to address problems related to operations-driven entropy. The fact that GCFF was specialising in fantasy films meant that it was dependent upon a niche market. To make matters more challenging, GCFF only acquired fantasy films via Australian distributors, thus its situation was doubly dependent.

In order to gain entry into the federation, the film festival director needed to prove the viable operational pedigree of GCFF. He was required therefore, to send a document demonstrating the strength of the festival's program, any patrons or important guest filmmakers involved, and the existence of workshops or other sidebar activities. Only after having presented this information was the festival director informed that GCFF membership would be voted at the next general assembly which coincided with the Cannes Film Festival, and so unfortunately, even if successful, this strategy would not be implemented until the following operational cycle.

¹⁹ From 2002 to 2006 the Brussels event had been the unofficial model for GCFF.

Outcome and analysis of feedback

The following section discusses the importation-based results of the GCFF 2008 operational cycle. It is a candid review of the overall effectiveness of the eight strategies implemented by the festival director, though given that the film festival operation had been suspended following the 2006 edition, any importation which occurred in 2008 can be considered an improvement in operation. Through this retrospective analysis the interconnectivity of various strategies becomes apparent.

Those means by which the festival director re-energised the importation channels will also be examined. The submission of funding acquittals and operational modifications indicative of communicated feedback will be examined. This process is considered of critical importance to the completion of a successful cycle of operation since it lays the foundations for the re-energisation of the environment.

It is important to note that the director, after the completion of his tenure for 2008, was to leave the festival to take up a position as program manager at the Brisbane International Film Festival. His departure was, this time, known in advance, and so, in order to prevent a repeat of the open system condition of operations-driven entropy previously encountered by the festival, the replacement festival director became involved in operation in early July. Therefore, the impact of a transitional period between the two directorships would be minimalised and the new cycle of operation could begin immediately.

Co-operative alliances analysis

As previously mentioned, the festival director engaged six external organisations to strategically increase the importation capabilities of GCFF. As a collective group, these alliances were extremely effective and enabled GCFF to secure the participation of new resource providers, while simultaneously achieving operational requirements indicative of gratifying the needs of other resource providers motivated to interact via different importation-based strategies. For example, the partnership formed with Broadbeach Alliance not only provided GCFF with an opportunity to expand the audience participation at the festival through the outdoor screening of *Endless Summer*, but also helped the festival to satisfy the participation-based requirements imposed by the Community Gambling Benefit Fund. In the funding proposal submitted to CGBF, the festival director

assured the Fund that should GCFF receive funding to purchase an outdoor cinema it would facilitate free, community screenings.

The co-operative alliance formed with Riding for the Disabled posed a more complex situation. Due to the fact that funding from Festivals Australia was entirely dependent upon the participation of RDA, the organisation needed to play a prominent role in the film-based project 'Possibilities'. This role was fulfilled by RDA members taking part in the production process and ultimately being featured in the multi-screen event. The festival director therefore needed to communicate the exact parameters of interaction with RDA management to ensure that this alliance would remain in place for the duration of the funding submission process, which lasted four months, as well as to the completion of the production of 'Possibilities', which took an additional three months.

A similar reciprocal agreement had been made with Special Olympics Queensland (SOQ). In fact, the original Festivals Australia application listed both RDA and SOQ as featured participants. However, after confirmation was made from FA that GCFF was to be allocated funding, SOQ inexplicably withdrew their participation. The situation ended favorably with a written explanation to FA regarding the unfortunate withdrawal yet it does re-enforce the challenges of open system operation. That is, regardless of the apparently 'guaranteed' nature of some importation, there is always a chance that a resource will be lost in the lead up to its actual acquisition. Similarly, it exposes a drawback of relying too strongly on this strategy; co-operative alliances are inherently complex due to the reciprocal nature of the partnership. In most cases the benefits of co-operating are able to sustain involvement, yet, as demonstrated in the case of SOQ, a change of attitude may cause withdrawal with short or no notice, and so potentially disorganise projects aimed at strengthening the position of the film festival.

Date placement analysis

The October date placement of GCFF was beneficial to the importation of resources due to the fact the festival director had an adequate amount of time to facilitate operation. During the ten-month lead up to the event, the director was able to successfully implement a range of importation based strategies as well as develop activities such as 'Fantastic Sneak Peeks'. In fact, the integration of 'Fantastic Sneak Peeks' into Gold Coast Bazaar in late June provided the director with ideal timing in which to begin a more aggressive campaign to raise the profile of GCFF. Within two weeks of the Australian

premiere of *The Ruins* another ‘Fantastic Sneak Peeks’ was organised, this time featuring the Queensland premiere of the 1968 Olympics-based documentary *Salute* (2008). So, five months prior to the actual film festival, GCFF was receiving broad press coverage and demonstrating new functional capacity as an event through the successful integration of a sports-themed film.

Additional date-based benefits were also forthcoming. As previously mentioned, the actual dates of GCFF were chosen in part because of the spring school holidays which concluded in the first weekend of October. In order to take advantage of the tourist market so produced, the outdoor screening of the film *Endless Summer* was scheduled for this time. In fact, the main motivation for Broadbeach Alliance to partner with GCFF was the facilitate a ‘Spring into Summer’ event that could be used to fulfil their mandate in attracting potential customers to the Broadbeach area. Therefore, even though GCFF was purposely planned to avoid the school holidays, organisers were still able to hold an event that could seek to capture part of the temporary influx of people to the Gold Coast. Similarly, the event served to raise the profile to GCFF in the time immediately leading into the film festival.

With regard to Australian distribution patterns, the true benefits of the October date were not sufficiently tested as the small program, diversity of films and variety of film sources, e.g., local filmmakers, meant GCFF had only minimal resource requests from the distributors; all were met without any problems. It was fortuitous that no ‘blockbuster’ films were released during the week of GCFF and so the event was not forced to compete for audience members at the Box Office.

Geographic location analysis

The decision to hold GCFF at a movie complex in one of Australia’s largest shopping centers was not as beneficial to importation as it could have been since the management of Pacific Fair would not endorse the film festival. Though the location was not to the detriment of the event, e.g., close to public transport, centrally located, lots of parking, it simply did not reach its full potential. If, on the other hand, GCFF had been able to form a co-operative alliance with Pacific Fair the benefits of the location would have increased the exposure of the event tenfold via shop window displays, newsletter announcements, e-mails, etc.

This aspect aside, the cinema management was pleased with the outcome of GCFF and suggested future editions facilitate a travel component which would see the festival utilising other Birch Carroll and Coyle cinemas located around the Gold Coast. Such a plan would effectively solve the difficulties associated with the sprawling character of the city. Similarly, the acquisition of 'Mobile Screen Fantastic' also presented a solution to involving a greater portion of the geographic area of the Gold Coast into future film festivals.

Finally, it is important to note that the international filmmakers who attended GCFF were all motivated in part by their desire to visit Australia. Interestingly the geographic positioning of GCFF had commonly been cited as the reason why the film industry did not attend the event in its earlier editions, in that was too far from America. While this reasoning does have some significance it is also important to consider how the experience of attending is framed for individual participants. That is, each individual participant has personal reasons for their interaction and if a film festival organiser is able to present gratification that correlates with these reasons the chance of participation is greatly improved. The attendance of the Browns, as a feature of their vacation, and of the English film director for pre-production assessment of the area, provide just two examples of how this can be achieved.

Identifiable function analysis

The use of identifiable functions to re-activate importation into GCFF was extremely successful for a number of reasons. First, the film festival organiser was able to effectively expand the type of interaction participants could expect to achieve and thus new resource providers such as Festivals Australia and the Gambling Community Benefit Fund were secured and supplied critical financial inputs. Additionally previous operational aspects that represented entropic threats were balanced in that the film festival's reliance upon niche fantasy programming was broadened to include sports and local films. Similarly, the identification of the Gold Coast community as a significant resource provider enabled the removal of the single source dependency GCFF had previously had with the film industry. The clearly communicated roles of the festival, too, allowed potential resource providers to formulate their own reasons for interaction, i.e., the sponsorship of Burleigh Brewing company was the result of the CEO identifying reward from an association with the community aspect of the festival as well as with its sports theme. Finally, the promotion of culture as an integral aspect of film festival operation –

the original decision to mask the ‘art’ component of the film festival was a short-sighted and exclusionary strategy – and cast the GCFF as a culturally-minded organisation which then allowed it to work towards an authoritative status.

The implementation of aspects of this strategy is not without its risks. The GCFF did not incorporate a filmmaking competition due to financial constraints, yet this situation did not compromise the legitimacy of the event as the film festival director never issued an entry form and so no films were submitted into the festival with the intention of seeking award-driven gratification. The opportunity for local filmmakers to become involved via the ‘Surfing – Show ’n’ Tell’ project provided enough incentive to encourage their involvement.

The history of GCFF’s inability to secure a sponsor suitable for the enabling of a filmmaking competition serves to demonstrate the dangers inherent in this strategy. Initially the festival director had identified a film competition as being a desirable part of GCFF in order to re-motivate Warner Roadshow Studios into sponsorship. Yet after first verbally agreeing to participate in this capacity Warner Roadshow Studios later withdrew the offer citing the onset of the Global Financial Crisis. Had the process of creating a competition been set in motion on the basis of that verbal agreement and an influx of entries commenced, the festival would have been placed in an embarrassing and financially problematic situation.

Legitimising affiliations analysis

The strategy of implementing legitimising affiliations proved instrumental in the re-activation of GCFF, especially with regard to the affiliation with the Gold Coast City Council which was of major importance in terms of the credibility it gave to the event both locally and nationally. Similarly, the media coverage generated by the Browns’ attendance raised the public awareness of the GCFF and increased the potential for audience attendance through publicity. As is the case with co-operative alliances, however, the incentive for affiliation could change thus causing withdrawal of support, and so it was extremely important that great consideration was given to ensure each affiliate was satisfied with their involvement.

For the most part, affiliates who attended the festival could provide immediate feedback. Thus, immediate rectification of problems or changes to better suit their requirements, and the requirements of others could be administered and re-energisation

take place almost instantaneously. However the large number of government sponsors unfortunately meant that the likelihood of a physical attendance was not always possible. This, and the bureaucratic nature of all relationships with governmental bodies, meant that all government sponsors required an acquittal of the event.

Such acquittals provide proof that an event held is applying the granted funding in an appropriately designated manner and in line with what had been originally proposed in the application for the funding. In the case of GCFF, evidence was provided that the funding had been effectively allocated to the film festival within strict parameters of its use, e.g., time limits, key performance indicators, expectations as to how money would be spent, etc.

In order to ensure future opportunities for GCFF funding, these acquittals were all successfully submitted and accepted. A successful lodging of these acquittals was an indicator that those particular resource providers had been re-energised, although a number of acquittals required explanations regarding some projects' outcomes, such as the previously mentioned withdrawal of Special Olympics Queensland.

The most challenging aspect of this strategy is the need to consider and comply with the range of perceptions of participating affiliates. That is, the more affiliates a film festival has, the less decisional freedom organisers are likely to have over potentially controversial issues, such as, the programming of violent or sexually explicit films. So, with this strategy also comes responsibility of stewardship of the ideals and public perceptions of each affiliate. It is for this reason that many times when a legitimising affiliation such as sponsorship is withdrawn due to conflict, it is not likely to be re-activated unless the film festival is able to demonstrate operational changes that will satisfy the affiliate that their needs will now be met.

Participation-based incentives analysis

GCFF was organised so that it offered qualities designed to motivate participation, in the form of film premieres, guest filmmakers, film industry-led workshops and seminars. In addition, low ticket prices and cultural opportunities contributed to the uniqueness of the film festival as an event worthy of consideration for involvement by a broad demographic. The film festival director recognised that in order for this strategy to be effective the incentives had to be made known, so considerable effort was put into the publicising of GCFF.

The Gold Coast media played a major role in raising the awareness of the event. Interviews, photos, social articles and full-page features were all published in the months prior to, and during the four-day film festival. This press coverage had a validating effect on the event that could then be used for re-energisation; they provided ‘proof’ that money had been allocated to a meaningful, community event. Data regarding the style and readership of all publications featuring GCFF was supplied with every funding acquittal under the rationale of framing GCFF as an effective and popular event worthy of future financial contributions.

One of the more interesting aspects of this particular strategy, with regard to film director’s experience, was the ‘gatekeeper’ mentality of the media. That is, in order to gain access to the media the film festival organiser first had to motivate the individual reporter/journalist/radio host to participate. In order to accomplish this, constant contact was kept with the various media outlets by alerting individuals to potential stories that might be of interest or to opportunities to interview festival guests. For the most part this technique worked, yet the perceived news-worthiness of an event was always contingent on the personal opinion of the individual journalist.

Similarly, information and data, such as press releases, were sent via previously mentioned co-operative alliance e-mail groups in an effort to raise the awareness of specific demographics. The effectiveness of the GCFF promotion again varied according to individual journalists and media outlets, but attempts to reach the broadest possible audience and make the information highly accessible via the e-mails were kept basic with the provision of hyperlinks should the recipient require further details.

The effectiveness of the participation-based incentives strategy will continue to grow with the establishment of GCFF as an organisation with standing in the film industry on the Gold Coast. Similarly, the versatility and range of incentives the film festival can offer to potential resource providers is an area of operation that can further develop participants’ dependency upon the festival. Awards or distribution opportunities for local films, for example, would help to strengthen the need local filmmakers have for GCFF, and could ultimately be used to further refine the strategy of resource control.

Resource control analysis

Although the open system conditions did not permit a comprehensive strategy of resource control to be implemented, what little control the film festival director did have

was used to advance aspects of importation. For example, the twenty-minute edit of *Highwater* was, because of its exclusivity, of great interest to Burleigh Brewing Company, so, in order to motivate sponsorship participation the festival director suggested that the official screening of the edit be held on-site at the brewery utilising GCFF's mobile cinema.

The screening of the film at the sponsor's place of business increased the company's benefit of participation as the brewery was able to use the event to raise its own community profile. The use of a non-traditional location as a venue further demonstrated the versatility of GCFF and the potential for similar niche screenings as an additional means of raising income year-round. Additionally, the atmosphere of the brewery screening gave the Browns personal gratification since the unusual choice of location matched the uniqueness of the twenty-minute edit and enhanced their personal appreciation of their vacation time.

Sanctioning organisations assessment

The particular use of the Sports Business Taskforce (SBT) as a sanctioning organisation was beneficial in helping to legitimise GCFF's role as an exhibitor of sports films. As previously mentioned sanctioning organisations are reminiscent of an exclusive club atmosphere, therefore, the fact that GCFF made contacts via SBT networking functions, as well as through SBT recommendations, meant other members were more likely to favourably consider those ideas that the film festival director was proposing regarding their potential sponsorship or the forming of co-operative alliances.

With regard to the European Fantastic Film Festivals Federation, acceptance meant GCFF would not only join a unique network of international film festivals, but more importantly would broaden the fantasy film importation stream with regards to future programming opportunities. Typically, the GCFF program primarily screened Asian fantasy films as these were the films most often acquired by Australian distributors. However, with the addition of EFFFF membership, GCFF would have the opportunity to feature fantasy films from Europe, effectively increasing the resource base from which films could be drawn.

Membership into EFFFF is not without its drawbacks. Joining the federation is not free and in order to become a full member GCFF would be required to host another EFFFF festival member at the festival. Thus, there are economic considerations connected to this strategy. Membership could pose an operational challenge if the federation does not permit

GCFE to screen sports films should it decides that they would conflict with the fantasy image of EFFFF.

These matters need to be considered by future GCFE organisers and decisions made regarding the open system strengths of the GCFE as a hybrid fantasy/sports-themed event. These strengths include but are not limited to: community participation, established co-operative alliances and legitimising affiliations, as well as the existing approval of a Gold Coast-based sanctioning organisation in the form of the SBT. Alternatively, by utilising the new benefits offered by EFFFF membership, such as increased fantasy film supply, membership into an established festival network, and an increased chance of greater fantasy film industry participation, GCFE may see itself undergoing another change of form and function and reverting to its previous incarnation as a site for more specialised fantasy film exhibition.

Conclusion

Through five individual film festival case studies this chapter has been able to demonstrate the practicality and effectiveness of the OSM of film festival operation proposed by this study. These case studies are indicative of the type of individual research required to gain a thorough understanding of the various open system conditions that influence particular aspects of individual film festival operation. Similarly, the fact that each film festival represents a different form of film festival, be it via size, scope or theme, further indicates the universal applicability of the OSM.

Of the five case studies, four represent ‘snap shot’ analyses, examining open system conditions particular to individual events and the subsequent strategic means employed by film festival organisers to promote efficient operation. These analyses range from the examination of a major international film festival (DIFF) to a community-based, franchise model designed to be implemented in a variety of locations (SO). The fifth case study represents a more comprehensive analysis of open system film festival operation as it involves a retrospective examination of the once defunct Gold Coast Film Fantastic and the strategic means by which the researcher was able to successfully re-activate resource importation in his role as festival director.

It is contended that these case studies represent an original and sound contribution to the field of film festival studies. The OSM proved to be effective in the systematic investigation of individual film festival operation, allowing for greater understanding of the

operational decisions as well as the importation-based thresholds of particular events. The next chapter will continue to discuss the impact of these case studies, broadening the scope to include the overall contributions this thesis has made to the field of film festival studies. It will also discuss those areas of potential future research opened up by this study and that are required to further the comprehensive understanding of an open system model of film festival operation as a whole.

Chapter Six

Introduction

In the previous chapter, five individual film festival case studies were conducted. These case studies examine various open system conditions, all of which are seen to have an influence upon each particular film festival's ability to import resources. Four of these case studies represent 'snap shot' analyses of extant festivals of varying forms and function and examine particular open system conditions, ranging from the virtually-based advantages of operating an online film festival, to the operational danger of a single source dependency currently utilised by organisers of the Insect Fear Film Festival.

The fifth and final case study represents a deeper and more intimate analysis of open system film festival operation. In examining the fourteen-month Gold Coast Film Fantastic festival directorship of this PhD candidate, it displays how the previously defunct open system operation of the Gold Coast Film Fantastic was successfully re-activated through the implementation of the eight importation-based strategies. The application of the open system model (OSM) to these five case studies will remain a critical focus of this chapter as those aspects of contemporary film festival research previously discussed are revisited.

The purpose of this chapter then, is to assess how the theoretical and practical application of an OSM of film festival operation can ultimately contribute to this burgeoning field of study. Additionally, those areas of research that lie beyond the scope of this dissertation but are still understood as important areas of academic examination will also be discussed.

This chapter will be presented in two parts. The first will address three specific areas of film festival research. These specific areas are identified as being lacking, and sometimes absent, from current academic investigations, and consist of:

- the prevalence of source-based subjectivity;
- the dearth of a formalised definition of what constitutes a film festival; and
- the common usage of ambiguous and metaphorical language when describing film festival operation.

The second part of this chapter focuses on areas deemed worthy of future research, with particular reference to the scholarly importance of examining conditions such as the potential for an over abundance of film festivals with regard to resource supply. A section

will also be devoted to a discussion of the complexity of operation which has been referred to numerous times throughout this study.

Source-based subjectivity

The prevalence of source based subjectivity was identified in the introduction as having a limiting effect on the information currently available about the operation of film festivals. Porton (2009) explains that in “some respects, film festival communiqués can be considered a form of travel writing” (p. 1). Often the nature of a commentator’s involvement with a festival leads to their reporting being more pandering and laudatory than analytic. Porton confirms this assessment:

Most of the writing on festivals by mainstream critics is inordinately celebratory. To a certain extent, this is attributable to the fact that magazine festival reports, even in highbrow journals, are at least partially written as ‘payback’ for either airfare, accommodations, or in the case of snootier festivals, the mere privilege of receiving accreditation. (p. 2)

The inadequacy of much festival reporting is further discussed by Peranson (2009) who observes that over time the testimonies of film critics have been compromised “to the point of printing plainly inaccurate information because they care more about impressing the media offices of the business festivals than reporting actual information” (p. 36).

The idea that such ‘inaccurate information’ exists and is circulated so as to influence the social-based perceptions of resource providers on a large scale is decidedly problematic. For example, Koehler (2009) notes that film festivals with a cinephilic focus are “threatened” by this dominant form of film festival reporting and holds that events with alternative functions are “seldom acknowledged in popular film journalism, in the trades, in industry accounts and (sadly) in cinema journals” (p. 81). Film festivals ‘different’ to those bearing the recognised characteristics of more popularised film festivals may be viewed as illegitimate. Koehler predicts the likely disappearance of these particular types of film festivals due to the media’s “general and unexamined aversion to cinephilia, and an unwillingness to place cinephilia at the centre of festivals’ activities” (p. 81).

A similar problem with subjectivity has been encountered by this study with regard to the referencing of a film festival as a ‘success’. For example, Alexander (1997) implies that in order for a film festival to successfully operate organisers must sell a critical mass of tickets, declaring that both the Montréal World Film Festival and the Toronto

International Film Festival provide examples of such success in that they sell “around ¼ million seats every year” (p. 17). The term *success* is used by film festival organisers, legitimising affiliates, or organisations engaged in a co-operative alliance to frame the perception of an event. Rithdee (2009) notes that a press release issued by the Tourism Authority of Thailand proclaiming the Bangkok International Film Festival a “success”, had in fact “painted a completely opposite picture” to the actual situation (p. 129).

The seemingly flippant use of this term leads to a situation where actual, successful film festival operation becomes increasingly difficult to recognise, and where the perceptions of resource providers become skewed towards a particular indicator of success, in the form of financial return, the number of premieres, or the number of Hollywood actors in attendance. For those festivals with concerns and operational aspirations that lie outside these indicators, such as the Insect Fear Film Festival or Haydenfilms Online Film Festival, this presents a serious problem when it comes to objective analysis of their achievements. Similarly, should consecutive film festival cycles demonstrate varying levels of participation, there is a chance for one edition to be viewed as more successful than the other. For example, Gilmore (2009) explains how successive Sundance festivals were differentiated according to film sales, stating “one festival was regarded by media pundits as a success, the other as a failure” (para. 4). This type of annual comparison has implications with regard to continually securing the support of resource providers as the social system decisions that determine motivation are reliant upon operational history.

A major concern arises, then, with regard to differentiating between the cultural or artistic goals of an organisation and those aims that are indicative of a business agenda. Simply stating that a film festival is not a success because it is unable to generate a net profit may overlook the function of the event as a cultural platform. In fact, evidence suggests that the majority of film festivals do not make money and that the idea that a film festival is a profit-making venture is potentially flawed. As Bangré (1996) explains “[f]estivals that are financed essentially by their own takings are few and far between.” (p. 158). Even the Vancouver International Film Festival, which generates more income from ticket sales than Toronto, Montréal or the Atlantic Film Festival, is still dependent upon “substantial cash sponsorship revenues” (SECOR, 2004, p. 48).

As Aleksandr Rodnyansky (in Gavrilova, 2009) explains the Russian-based *Kinotavr Film Festival* “is absolutely loss-making” (p. 19), and this is a characteristic that

may be extended to include two of the most prominent film festival currently in operation, the Sundance Film Festival (Smith, 1999) and the Toronto International Film Festival (Johnson, 2000), which both suffered major financial losses in their initial years of operation. In fact, Tom Di Mara (in Tanner, 2009) notes the economic challenges of film festival operation often determine the types of organisations that will facilitate the events by saying that, “[film] festivals are not lucrative. If festivals made a lot of money, they’d be commercial, more profit companies would do them, but they’re always done by non-profits because there’s not money there!” (p. 132).

The propensity for film festivals to lose money does not mean that finance information such as the profit or loss of a film festival should not be taken into account when evaluating viability; of course it should. The inability to make a profit is indicative of those operational costs associated with standard functionality – venue hire, print hire, publicity, etc – which lower the financially-driven threshold of an event. Yet such consideration must be made as part of a larger operational context.

This study is well aware that it has little to no ability to change how film critics cover film festivals. Such a movement must start from within film critic membership itself. However, through the application of the OSM it is possible for a standardised understanding of successful film festival operation to be determined. Therefore, this study proposes that success should be judged upon a film festival’s ability to complete an operational cycle rather than its ability to pull in the big bucks from non-cinephilic corporations, or to line a red carpet with glitterati. As has been discussed theoretically, and then demonstrated practically, film festival operation, when viewed from an open system perspective, can be seen to be entirely based upon the importation of resources. This model provides a common foundation from which to assess the successful functionality of any and all festivals. The ability of a festival to import a resource required for its operation, to transform that resource through its operation, and finally to output the transformed resource in a manifestation that promotes additional resource importation, thereby perpetuating interaction, provides a surer determinant of an event’s success than the number of premiers a festival may be able to muster which are statistics that may serve to motivate but do not actively re-energise.

This equating of years of operation with operational viability (or success), is already acknowledged as a gauge of success through the identification of the number of

years or editions a film festival has operated. For example, Elley (2004) refers to the “8th Puchon Fantastic Film Festival” (para. 1) while Shael Stolberg (2000) is particular in noting that the German-based *Max Ophuls Preis Film Festival* was “founded in 1980” (p. 23), and Will Tizard (2005) describes the Karlovy Vary Film Festival as having achieved its “40th edition” (para. 3) in a context that implies approval and optimism. Similarly, Rithdee (2009) makes note that Thailand’s Short Film and Video Festival “threw its 11th edition in August 2007 and is now the longest-running film festival in Thailand” (p. 125).

This exemplifies how an OSM may be used to better ascertain a rationalised means of understanding film festival operation. The fact that a film festival is able to complete a cycle of operation which then re-energises resource providers to continue interaction is a strong indicator as to the viability of the event. This viability is equivalent to the potential for operational longevity. That is, should a film festival fail to complete a cycle of operation, the resulting disorganisation will prevent the film festival from functioning until such a time as amendments are made which re-start importation.

The value of an OSM of operation is its ability to pinpoint those resource importation aspects of operation that can lead to such an assessment. Where, in the cases just mentioned, the continued operation of an event is implied, after the fact as it were, as a consequence of previous success, the OSM of operation outlined in this study allows festival organisers and researchers to assess those particular points of functionality that contribute to an event’s viability prior to, and during, its operation. Such a systematic means of deduction enables those examining film festivals to predict the likely longevity of a particular event.

Film festival or film market: towards a definition

On April 4th 2009, an International Film Festival Workshop was held at the University of St Andrews in Scotland. The proceedings of this workshop are reported by William Brown (2009) who, among other aspects of film festival studies, acknowledges a candid debate between attendees as to what characteristics constitute a film festival. The result is indicative of the subjectivity common to most film festival commentary. Numerous definitions were proposed, each arguing characteristics derived from an individual’s personal experience with events. For example, Brown (2009) reports that

“Nick Roddick of *Sight & Sound*, felt that film festivals must serve an economic function... Roddick also said that film festivals are defined by spectacle” (p. 218).

Additional viewpoints expressed the need to consider the interdisciplinary nature of film festival studies itself in order to develop a considered definition of the term. Thus, attendees such as Marijke de Valck, Richard Porton and Dina Iordanova noted the importance of including in any definition such concepts as the anthropological and sociological aspects of festivals, as well as “overlapping terms/fields” (Brown, 2009, p. 217) such as cinephilia, management and business, national/regional/local cultural histories, city planning/tourism and human resources/human rights, to list but a few.

Not surprisingly then, a formalised definition was not reached. The workshop does however serve to re-affirm the position of this thesis that the term *film festival* requires a centralised understanding if the field of film festival studies is to continue to develop into a major discipline. Interestingly, Brown (2009) notes that an attendee from the University of Southampton, Lucy Mazdon, “proposed that film festival studies, like film studies itself, should emerge from the bottom up, in the same way that the definition(s) of film festivals should emerge through particular case studies” (p. 222). It is just such a movement – from a theoretical open system foundation as practically applied to the analysis of individual case studies, towards an inclusive assessment and encapsulation of film festivals as a whole – that has formed the basis of the current study.

As has been previously mentioned, Gore (2001) divisively declares that online film festivals are “not really festivals” (p. 397). Yet the specific case study carried out on the Haydenfilms Online Film Festival by this study, argues the case that these virtual, Internet film festivals are influenced by open system conditions, and operate according to the same importation-based needs as their physically-based counterparts. As such, and in agreement with the expressed intentions of those who create such innovative avenues for the viewing and sharing of films, this inclusive OSM of film festival operation, deems online film festivals as valid examples of film festivals.

It seems reasonable to suggest that the OSM proposed by this study may be used to further formalise those characteristics that are specific to film festivals as a whole as the field of study endeavours to define itself. For example, evidence of an operational process that is based upon the importation, transformation and output of films through exhibition

can be seen as the primary quality upon which a formal definition of a film festival can be based.

The *methods* of importation are not important to this definition as the direct acquisition of films, be that from a sales agent, a call for entries targeting filmmakers, or the production of content via the strategy of resource control, ultimately represent the same means to an end, acquiring resources required for functionality. The absence of re-energisation in this primary quality takes into account the probability of disorganisation. So, events such as the Noosa Film Festival which failed to operate a second edition can still be considered film festivals; they simply display the unsuccessful re-energisation aspect of open system operation.

It is from this primary characteristic that a differentiation between film festivals and other film-based events such as film markets and film series/society screenings may be entered into. This delineation is of particular importance when deciding what events to exclude from film festival-specific research. For example, the business model of film festival operation discussed by Peranson (2009) shares a common characteristic with film markets, that being the primacy of distributor and film buyer/seller participation. Peranson describes such participation as being motivated by the distributor/seller's intention to "[d]omestically, use [the film festival] as a launching pad for soon-to-be released films, take advantage of festival/presence of talent to hold press junkets; buyers attend festivals looking to acquire new films" (p. 28). This description bears a striking resemblance to Turan's (2003) analysis of the film market ShoWest, which not only features the attendance of Hollywood stars, but also programs pre-release film screenings and is considered by him to be "a film festival if you like, for people who own movie theaters" (p. 50). Thus, there seems to be very little observable distinction between the two events other than the fact that film markets are traditionally for the film industry only. To further add to the challenge of differentiating the two events, film markets are commonly developed by film festival organisers as a means of increasing the participation-based incentives of particular film industry personnel, resulting in the infusing of a market into a film festival's operational structure.

Lauri Tanner (2009) asked Larry Horne, founder of the Los Angeles Gay and Lesbian Film Festival, "What makes a film festival for you?". Horne replied that it was "clearly about putting together a series of film and video that has some kind of logic of

grouping” (p. 103). As previously stated, the definition of a film festival is seen as a subjective formulation, a point re-affirmed by Horne in the same interview when he states that “you could call anything a film festival” (p. 103). However, film festivals *are* inherently different because, as Horne identifies, their operational structure is based entirely upon the *exhibition* of films. Thus, the key determinant in this situation is entropy. That is, due to the reliance a film festival has upon its environment for particular resources, it develops an operational signature that is unique and specifically different from a film market or a film society.

The specific type of entropy encountered by film festivals was explained by this thesis as being unlike other open system organisations due to the intensity with which it occurs over a relatively short period of time. Within the span of weeks or even days, huge amounts of imported resources are transformed and subsequently output. Chief among these resources are films. This intensity of entropy is fundamentally different from a monthly film society screening in which prolonged periods of activity are better suited to their particular resource providers.

Film markets however, also are observed to have short, intense periods of operation. Yet, the entropy faced by film markets, and that with which they are most pre-occupied, is primarily participation-based. So, for example, Carl Diorio (2004) reports that the organisers of ShoWest “expect to surpass the 2,700 paid registrants that attended ShoWest 2003, and exhibit floor space is expected to jump at least 4% to 47,000 square feet” (para. 24). The business-based focus of ShoWest is indicative of the commerce-driven intentions of film markets in general. In fact, films as a resource within the film market structure can even be viewed as a secondary component of their operation; as the by-product of business agendas. The screening of films at film markets is not integral to the function of the event as it is with film festivals. Evidence of the pre-eminence of a business prerogative is that film markets sometimes screen only trailers or “maybe just posters” (Beauchamp & Behar, 1992, p. 89) and regard this as sufficient to successfully conduct trade.

A film market’s *raison d’être* is the conducting of business and this requires the participation of the film industry in the form of physical attendance. Interestingly, Ebert (1987) notes that the physical duration of participation at Cannes is determined by the participants’ professional objectives: “directors and the actors stay only for a day or two, to promote their picture. The buyers and sellers go home after they’ve made a deal” (p. 142).

The observation that the involvement of those participants with direct business intentions, i.e., to sell or buy films, lasts only as long as required is equivalent to the ‘perishable’ quality and ‘limited shelf life’ attributed to films by Iordanova (2009) and Rosenthal (in Tanner, 2009). Therefore, even though film markets and film festivals may share common open system characteristics with regard to operation, the dependency each organisation has upon different resources enables a discernable, entropy-based division which can then be exploited to gain better understanding regarding the unique characters of each phenomenon.

In terms of its open system model this thesis proposes that the defining characteristics of a film festival include but are not limited to:

- an observable operational process primarily based upon the importation, transformation and *exhibition of films*;
- the employment of secondary, often strategic structural objectives, e.g., a film competition, a film market, workshops, etc. that contribute to a film festival organiser’s ability to *successfully import films to display*;
- a constant, film-based entropic condition that sees any inability to *secure films for screening* as potentially threatening to the viable operation and longevity of the event.

Such a formulation has the advantage of marrying the operational aspects of festival organisation with its functional aspects in order to present a definition where *films*, and the watching of films, lie at the heart of the film festival. Film markets, when they cannot be identified as separate entities in themselves through their unique susceptibility to participation-driven entropy, but rather are merged with festivals in a hybrid form, can then be regarded as another, though important, participation-based resource importation strategy. This presents the discipline of film festival studies with the possibility of concentrating its attention on the primacy of *films* to rather than on the practice of economics.

Ambiguous and metaphorical language

When discussing film festival operation, most authors adopt a sensationalist approach with regard to the type of language they employ. For example, the operational performance of the Cannes Film Festival has been described as moving with “the pace of a coal-stoked locomotive compared to the sleek speed of the TGV” (Nesselson, 1997, p. 44); the operational stability of the Slamdance Film Festival is seen as “Coming of Age” (Foundas, 2005, title); and the Montréal World Film Festival was reported as having a

“near death” experience when it lost the financial support of two government sponsors (Kelly, 2007, para. 4).

As colourful and evocative as these descriptions may be, they are not conducive to in-depth academic research and analysis. When Ken Eisner (1998) explains that the Seattle International Film Festival “limped along for the first few years” (para. 3) he obviously means to indicate that the film festival had operational difficulties, yet interpreting exactly what constitutes a ‘limp’ as opposed to what is a ‘normal gait’ is not apparent.

Through the use of the OSM, this study is able to effectively utilise terminology designated by established theorists (von Bertalanffy, 1950, 1968, 1972; Katz & Kahn, 1978) to discuss concepts of film festival operation. The application of terms such as importation, re-energisation and entropy are well referenced in open system theory literature and provide a more precise and measured approach when discussing specific aspects of basic film festival operation than those currently employed by any existing film festival-based source.

Similarly, the terminology of open system theory appropriately matches the metaphorical language traditionally used to assess film festival operation. For example, references to film festivals as “decaying” (Cowie, 2003, p. 400) or having “bitten the dust” (Langer, 2000, p. 17) are equivalent to the observation of the entropic effects of resource depletion and their resultant disorganisation. So, through the use of open system terminology an extant and expansive vocabulary is available to enable confident standardisation of those metaphorical descriptions commonly used in film festival coverage. The systematic processes of open system theory, e.g., the necessary importation of external resources and their subsequent transformation and output, may be employed to translate those even more ambiguous descriptions. So, when Elley (1998) reports that the London Film Festival “sprang to life in 1957” (p. 169), the physical act of ‘springing’ can be understood to represent the initial activation of the event’s importation streams.

The terms and premises of social system interaction in the way that they address resource provider relations as presented by Parsons (1951) have also been instrumental in formalising this study’s discussion of film festivals. Remarking on the social aspects of film festival operation presents a major challenge, too, since the literature currently lacks designated terms for conveying what is observed to occur between film festivals and their respective resource providers. The terminology of social systems can similarly be used to

elucidate the sometimes opaque vernacular of some commentators. So, Serge Losique's accusation that a previous government supporter of the Montréal World Film Festival (WFF) was trying to "torpedo" the event (Kelly, 2004, para. 4) can be re-stated as the methodical steps taken by Telefilm to effectively isolate the festival from its other resource providers.

Through Parsons' rationalisation of 'ego' and 'alter' interaction this study is able to put forth a social system-based framework congruent and complementary to OSM. The result of which enables an identification and discussion of eight importation-based strategies utilised by film festival organisers to increase resource importation. The contribution of these strategies corresponds with Rhyne's (2009) call for attention "to the motivations of [festival] stakeholders [so as to] help to lay the groundwork for a methodology for festival studies that extends beyond the typical focus on filmmakers, programmers and audiences" (p. 16).

The 'groundwork' provided by this study includes the formulation of a terminology employing such terms as legitimising affiliations, co-operative alliances, resource control, etc., which is indicative of the various types of relationships film festival organisers enter into and utilise with external participants, and yet is still internally consistent with the open and social system models advocated. The identification of importation-based strategies in particular, provides a systemic lense through which to view the interconnectivity of participation. This was illustrated, for example, in the required participation of specific resource providing groups, such as the media, or the attendance of Hollywood stars, and the subsequent incentives they present to the various other forms of resource provider involvement and gratification.

Having identified and discussed the benefits an OSM of film festival operation presented by this study with regard to overcoming specific research-based challenges, this chapter will now contemplate areas of future research.

Future research

The rationale for including future research further identifies the benefits of an OSM of film festival operation. First, it establishes the OSM framework as a platform from which to investigate conceptually similar topics without the need to establish film festivals as socially-based, open system organisations. Next, it demonstrates the viable application of OSM to a range of diverse and conceptually advanced areas of film festival functionality

that, for reasons of topical scope, were only touched upon by this study. Finally, it acknowledges the theoretical parameters of the study thus justifying any additional, original research choosing to utilise open system theory in a manner not presented or discussed by this thesis.

Three specific themes of future research are here identified and discussed:

- the application of the remaining five open system characteristics understood to be beyond the basic operation of film festivals;
- the development and utilisation of empirical data that explores the correlation between the number of film festivals operating and the conditioning of resource provider expectations/perceptions; and
- the intricacies of social system operation and the prevalence of function-based paradoxes which arise when considering a more advanced perspective of film festival operation.

Each theme will be outlined utilising examples and commentary to frame the subject and to designate points of possible departure. Though each theme is viewed as equally important there is ascension in terms of their reliance upon other disciplines. That is, while the first theme is clearly open system-based, the final theme is indicative of a multi-disciplinary investigation, and which could also incorporate additional theories such as Actor Network Theory.

Second- tier operational characteristics

In designing the framework of the OSM proposed by this study, it was explained that of the ten numbered open system characteristics discussed by Katz and Kahn (1978) the first four were vital to basic functionality while the remaining six characteristics were more appropriately positioned in a second tier of operational functionality. The rationale behind this partition was to enable this study to concentrate on those *fundamental* components of open system theory indicative of basic film festival operation, thereby effectively mapping the four-phase systematic process in which an imported resource is eventually returned to the environment in an effort to promote further, future resource importation.

While the remaining five characteristics are understood to be essential, their actual contributions in maintaining sound film festival operation are, for reasons previously explained, not recognised within the immediacy of this study. Thus, a future examination

of an OSM of film festival operation which assesses the functional role of these characteristics presents not only an important continuation of the OSM theme, but also offers the potential for highly rewarding investigations into film festival/resource provider interaction.

A brief summary of the types of information which an exploration of these characteristics may yield is as follows.

5. Negative entropy.

The term negative entropy has been referenced extensively throughout this study when discussing specific aspects of film festival operation. The eight OSM resource importation strategies, for example, identify the promotion of negative entropy as central to the cycle of operation, e.g., input, transformation, output and re-energisation, as it refurnishes those resources that are spent through film festival operation.

While this study has effectively incorporated preliminary aspects of this characteristic into the OSM there is still much potential for future research to be carried out, and once again this has much to do with the complexity of operation. For example, examination could be devoted to developing an understanding of the correlation between operational longevity and efficient promotion of negative entropy. This information would be extremely useful in advancing the predictability of the operational success of established film festivals which, due to their operational endurance may benefit from ‘close knit’ social networks purposely structured to annually re-energise the film festival.

6. Information input, negative feedback and the coding process

Feedback and other corrective procedures were mentioned during particular aspects of individual case studies in Chapter 5. In fact, the final section of the Gold Coast Film Fantastic was based upon a retrospective assessment of the eight importation-based strategies implemented by the festival director.

Future research with regard to this characteristic could provide information detailing structural modifications to festival operation indicative of the needs and requests of resource providers and the subsequent result, such as the replacing of a certain participation-based incentive such as a trophy with that of a cash prize. Such information could begin to map those incentives that correlate with particular resource providers and

identify those strategies required to accomplish successful fulfilment of altered requirements for their gratification.

7. The steady state and dynamic homeostasis

The stabilising influence of self-regulation, i.e., ensuring effective operational practice through the existence of a continuous stream of resources into a film festival that subsequently matches the rate of entropy that occurs through operation, is crucial. Careful examination of such streams holds the potential to further predict the operational longevity of a particular event.

The strategies of both legitimising affiliations and resource control afford film festivals organisers a degree of management over those open system conditions which might otherwise threaten operation. Both strategies have been shown capable of furnishing film festivals with resources allocated under specified conditions, be it a contract or other type of agreement. These conditions often prevent the immediate withdrawal of resources, and thus film festival organisers are able to commit themselves to the development and management of other, less governable, aspects of operation.

Future research into this characteristic could, and perhaps should, include examining the correlation between periods of operational restructuring, such as the formation of a new programming stream, and those acquisitions that promote operational security. For example, the Denver International Film Festival entered into a restructuring period upon attainment of funding from Starz Entertainment Group and the Science and Cultural Facilities District, at which time the film festival organisers re-evaluated the co-operative alliances they had formed with other community groups. The outcome of this re-evaluation was seen as a streamlining of operations and those alliances deemed unnecessary or ineffective were discontinued.

8. Differentiation

As previously mentioned, differentiation is a process that sees social organisations move “towards the multiplication and elaboration of roles with greater specialization of function” (Katz & Kahn, 1978, p. 29). Film festivals have, since their inception in 1932, become more diverse in their roles, subsequently operating within a variety of niche and speciality areas, hence the impetus behind this study.

The case studies conducted by this study represent a range of operational types both in terms of themes and physical operational structure, but this is far from an exhaustive collection. Future research regarding the characteristic of differentiation could explore issues including: the operational structures of ‘copy cat’ film festivals and the cyclic-edition in which operational modifications occur, sometimes making the event more efficient than the copied original model; the correspondence between differentiation and technological advancements, e.g., digital cameras and projectors; or the critical, base participation necessary for a film festival to justify the operation of a previously non-existent film festival theme or physical structure.

9. Integration and co-ordination

Though integration has not been observed to occur in film festivals on a major scale, this study did briefly address the attempts to impose shared operational values and norms through the strategy of sanctioning organisations. Thus, organisations such as FIAPF and EFFFF announce codes of practice indicative of integration, but fail to have the authority to implement such devices on a large scale due to the availability of resources.

On the other hand, co-ordination is seen in the very existence of the film festival circuit. The strategy of date placement not only defines the territory of an event but also enables participants to plan their attendance/involvement accordingly. It is possible too, for such co-ordination to occur without the active participation of film festival organisers, as such activity may be conducted via an outside participant such as a sales agent or distributor who moves a film print from one film festival to the next.

Future research could entail an examination of those film festivals which actively engage in either integration or co-ordination, or both simultaneously, and the observable importation-based benefits they receive, as opposed to those events which purposely do not practice this characteristic. The result would provide additional data regarding the effectiveness of this characteristic in sustaining a cycle of operation.

10. Equifinality

Equifinality is the ability of a system to reach “the same final state from differing internal conditions and by a variety of paths” (Katz & Kahn, 1978, p. 30). This characteristic is apparent in the five case studies conducted by this study (and indeed in every festival that completes a cycle of operation). That is, given the wide range of open system conditions each event was successfully operated so as to acquire those resources

required for operation, utilising a variety of strategic means. The decision to implement particular strategies was dependent upon the operational strengths of the individual film festival.

Additional research with regard to this subject would continue to prove the idiosyncratic nature of film festival operation and underline the importance of internal assessments of those operational conditions that could impede or benefit resource importation. Case studies could be undertaken to, for example, compare similar film festivals in different countries. With specific regard to this study, a particularly interesting examination could be conducted on the operational success of the Shoot Out franchises, by investigating the implementation of the same successful operational structure in seemingly different environments.

All of this is not to imply that the five open system characteristics already analysed by this study would not also be well served by further research. The re-energisation process and the allied notion of negative entropy, for example, would, if exposed to specialist examination be particularly fruitful areas for further study. As has already been noted throughout this work and will be revisited shortly in this chapter, film festivals are complex social systems whose operations are determined by intricate and interconnected chains of action and reaction. Further investigation into the ways in which particular re-energisation strategies resonate throughout a festival's organisation to produce various forms of negative entropy essential to the maintenance of operation would be bound to yield valuable results. A single phone call to the right resource provider at the right time; the reflexive prioritising of interactions with particular participants under certain conditions; not contacting a resource provider at all so as to avoid conflict: any of these actions or inactions is capable of producing unexpected results for the festival organiser willing to consider their ramifications.

A thorough examination of the intricacies of contingent actions, possibly conducted from, and informed by, a sociological or even psychological foundation would be sure to offer many valuable insights into the complex nature of human interaction that plays such an important part in negotiating the minefield that so often is film festival organisation.

Empirical data

This study began by identifying that the Google search engine lists over 30 million references to the term *film festival*; evidence of the extent to which these events have permeated contemporary society. This figure is an important detail given the ‘experience’ factor that plays such a critical role in developing perceptions and ultimately motivating resource provider participation. Simply put, the greater the ‘known’ qualities of film festivals in general, the less likely film festival organisers will need to ‘educate’ potential participants as to the functional dimensions and potentials for involvement in their specific events. Therefore, open system conditions similar to that which existed during the initial operation of the Denver International Film Festival, which found it difficult to raise support for what was then an alien concept, are less likely to be repeated now, thirty years later; at least in a major metropolitan area.

The extent to which film festivals occupy operational positions on a global scale is not known. That is to say, no document containing empirical data which charts the historical increase in the number of film festivals since 1932 is yet to surface in any academic or practical research. This study too skirts the issue, though an early attempt to graph the commencement dates of 500 film festivals was undertaken by the researcher, only to be abandoned due to the persistence of incommensurable variables, such as conflicting ‘official dates’; to the acknowledgment that such information is beyond the introductory role of basic film festival operation; and to the necessity of completing the current study!

Future research dedicated to establishing an empirical database documenting the rise in film festival numbers as a whole, would be a major contribution to the field of study. Presently only estimates exist. For example, Stringer (2001) claims vaguely that “an average of over-forty towns and cities now hold events [film festivals] during each and every month of the year” (p. 143). Langer (2000) and Stolberg (2000) claim to list over 500 film festivals in their respective guide books, with the cover of Gore’s *The Ultimate Film Festival Guide* (2001) boasting the inclusion of “over 600 film fests worldwide”. However, it is important to note that the authors of these guide books often include film markets as well as film series in their totals, and neglect to include many smaller events.

SECOR Consulting (2004) claims that at the time of its analysis there existed “several thousand film festivals worldwide” (p. 17), while de Valck (2007) provides a

more approximate figure by narrowing the number to “between 1,200 and 1900” (p. 105). Interestingly, Turan (2003) notes that even sanctioning organisations such as the FIAPF are unable to provide an accurate count (p. 2). This is a particularly ironic situation given the organisation’s claim to be a “regulator of international film festivals” (FIAPF, 2009, para. 3).

Knowing how many film festivals are in operation at a particular point in time would yield important information that could be used to develop a correlation between open system conditions, such as the appearance of digital technology and its subsequent democratisation of filmmaking, and the rise in the number of events aimed at accommodating this new resource group. Similarly, such data could present statistics valuable to a discussion of the competition for resources which occurs between certain film festivals. This is of particular importance given the finite amount of ‘quality’ films understood to be produced each year (Quintín, 2009; Cousins, 2009; Koehler, 2009; Quandt, 2009).

Additionally, specifics detailing the number of film festivals in operation may also be used to understand the impact event proliferation has had on the perceived benefits of events with regard to specific resource providers. As Sambolgo (1996) explains a real discomfort has existed for some time with African film-makers regarding the proliferation of festivals and their consequences. The frequency of the festivals (festivals are often only a week or even less apart) has as one consequence the overexploitation of the films. (p. 159)

Such ‘overexploitation’ can be understood to deter participation as the “shelf-life” (Iordanova, 2009; Rosenthal in Tanner, 2009) of a film screened is drastically reduced. For example, Oliver Barlet (1998) notes the proliferation of African film festivals has impacted on African filmmakers by making “it even more difficult to gain access to the traditional commercial distribution circuits” (p. 258).

Finally, future study has the potential to predict what de Valck (2007) terms “market saturation” (p. 105). Though she refers specifically to the threshold of the festival *circuit*’s ability to accommodate new film festivals, a similar principal must be considered with regard to the open system operation of film festivals in general. That is, film festivals can be seen to be able to continue operating only for as long as they are able to acquire sufficient resources. Should a situation develop in which demand exceeds supply then

mass disorganisation could take place. The most efficient method of gaining such information is via an empirical survey. Such information would be extremely useful in developing a more comprehensive understanding of the limits to which an open system environment can successfully support film festival operation.

Complexity of film festival operation

Reference has been made many times to the ‘complexity’ of film festival operation. The root of this complexity derives from the social system foundation in which the motivation for interaction occurs. The fact that film festivals require various resources, often from diverse sources, contributes to paradoxical situations in which the gratification of one participant is grounds for the withdrawal of another. It is apposite here to recall Pfeffer and Salancik’s (2003) note that while it is “clearly easier to satisfy a single criterion or mutually compatible set of criteria” – the task to which this study has largely been addressed – the difficulties associated with the “conflicting” and “competing demands” posed by “a variety of participants” makes the management of organisations complex and challenging, since rarely does an all-accommodating solution exist (p. 261).

This situation has been pointed to as the the interconnectivity of interaction. So, a seemingly beneficial operational decision, such as the acceptance of funding from a particular sponsor, could have wide-ranging effects on the collective identity of the event. It could, for example, contribute to the film festival’s operational success in that it represents a legitimising affiliation, or alternatively, it could cause the departure of other, un-related resource providers unwilling to share association with the new member. For example, both Hope (2004) and Webber (2005) note the struggle that the organizers of the Sydney Film Festival faced in keeping a balance between film industry participation and the cultural aspirations of the event.

Similar participation-based balancing is noted by Gamson (1997) who identifies the collective identities of both the New York Lesbian and Gay Film Festival and The New York Lesbian and Gay Experimental Film Festival and their respective resource providers as the cause of many operational challenges in that “the New Festival faced criticism and self-criticism” of its *identifiable function* as a “community event” due to the predominance of films directed by white males (p. 247).

This topic is indicative of an advanced condition of film festival operation research. That is, while the OSM presented by this study takes into consideration the importance of

the social system in determining motivation, it does not attempt to investigate those aspects that are seen as existing beyond the scope of basic interaction. This includes both the collective identities formed through film festival-resource provider interaction and the extended role of institutionalisation, that is, those formal operational structures, that are observed to have an influencing effect upon the perceived operational legitimacy of film festivals in general.

It was previously mentioned that de Valck (2007) employs both Network Theory and Actor Network Theory (ANT) as a means of grasping the inner workings of the film festival circuit. Both of these theories and their application to film festival operation are identified as constituting more advanced analysis due to the fact they incorporate aspects of this operational complexity into their basic ideology. Future research into the complexity of operation could profit greatly by using these theories as a framework.

Such future research should include in-depth examinations of the conditions of participation and in particular, be developed specifically from the perspective of the individual resource provider. Such information would, in effect, ‘complete the picture’ of film festival/resource provider interaction. This would enable a greater understanding as to why the eight importation-based strategies identified by this study are effective in presenting a more beneficial scenario of interaction than participation devoid of such manipulation. An additional potential topic would be an investigation of the obfuscation of operation employed by film festival organisers as a means of deterring too much external involvement in the operational process. Festival operation is often conducted as a ‘smoke and mirrors’ affair where the frenetic nature of organisation is hidden from participants in order to avoid any discomfort they may feel in observing the ‘organised chaos’ that can sometimes occur as organisers juggle resources and apply ‘quick fixes’ to entropic events.

The complexity of operation constitutes one of the most important areas of future study with regard to developing a comprehensive understanding of film festival operation under an open system paradigm. Knowing exactly why resource providers participate will enable a greater insight, and ultimately contribute to a more advanced means of determining film festival longevity. However, such study requires a more in-depth examination of Organisational and Social-based theories than entered into by this study, and researchers should consider this area only after building an appropriate base of knowledge.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the research-based advantages presented by the OSM of film festival operation. It has determined that the basic operational structure consisting of importation, transformation, output and re-energisation provides a framework in which the subjectivity of reported information may be scrutinised so as to produce a more objective result; a more appropriate means of determining the successful operation of a film festival. Similarly, the examination of the different types of entropy has enabled film festivals to be distinguished from other similar, but varying film-based events such film markets. Finally, the terminology and framework presented by the architects of open system theory, as well as of social systems, has been shown to be instrumental in the establishment of a formalised language as a more direct means of discussing film festival operation.

The second part of the chapter discussed three areas of potential future research: the completed analysis of the five remaining characteristics of an open system identified by Katz and Kahn (1978), the need for empirical data illuminating how the number of film festival in operation influences open system operation and finally the important and next logical step of examining open system film festival interaction from a resource provider's perspective. These areas of future film festival research constitute exciting new possibilities for the field of film festival studies and present great opportunities for contributions to be made to the understanding of film festival operation as a whole.

Conclusion

As the Introduction of this study explains, current film festival studies is seen, not only by this researcher but also by established authorities in the field, to be lacking in several areas of academic analysis. Among the most important areas in need of attention, and the declared focus of this thesis, is the development of a model that formalises basic film festival operation. Further, it is contended that such formalisation should provide this burgeoning field with an appropriate means through which to investigate and comprehend those aspects of film festival operation, such as the predicting of the operational longevity of specific events, that are not easily deducible through current research methods.

Among those factors seen to be impeding investigations are: the lack of historical scholarship; a predominance of subjective, non-analytical source materials; the absence of a manner by which to frame a definition of the very term *film festival*; and the preponderance of ambiguous and metaphorical language used when discussing film festivals in general. In order to address these deficits and ultimately achieve the stated aim of producing a meaningful assessment of film festival operation, this study has deemed the implementation of a systematic representation of film festival functionality as necessary and appropriate.

The current work proposes that such a representation may be accomplished by utilising the system-based work of Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1950, 1968, 1972) in conjunction with an application of Open System Theory as developed by Daniel Katz and Robert L. Kahn (1978), and interpolating the contrived nature of participant interaction within social systems highlighted by Talcott Parsons (1951). It is understood that the final result could form the foundation for a conceptual framework in which a model of basic film festival operation could be formalised. The following summarises how this systematic approach has been applied to film festivals through the course of this study in order to present a linear, logical and cumulative argument identifying basic film festival operation as a four-phase open system process entirely dependent upon the importation of external resources for functional viability.

Chapter One carries out an examination of those pre-existing models of film festival operation recognised as having some significance but that are ultimately deemed unsuitable for the type of systematic rigor required in establishing the basic components of film festival operation. Most of these models are viewed as unfit for serious academic

application due to their simplistic theoretical bases and their consequent lack of supportive data. Another model, rich in theory – perhaps too rich – is indicated, but set aside as being complex beyond the pragmatic needs of film festival organisers.

Chapter Two establishes the historical origins of von Bertalanffy's (1972) General System Theory and its subsequent incorporation into the social sciences by Kenneth Boulding (1956), Talcott Parsons (1951) and Katz and Kahn (1978). This chapter ascertains the appropriateness of the theoretical application of Open System Theory to film festivals. The suitability of this application is determined through a series of deductions which ultimately sees film festivals to be open systems: socially-based organisations intrinsically connected to their environment and subject to an unavoidable dependency on outside resources such as films, funding and audience participation in order to function. After determining the aptness of Open System Theory (OST) to the provision of a conceptual framework this chapter explains that the theory's practical underpinnings enable the identification of those aspects of film festival operation that are most basic to functionality – the importation of resources – thereby establishing a thematic centre from which the potential operational longevity of a film festival may be investigated.

Chapter Three proposes that basic film festival operation may be structured upon the four initial characteristics of an open system identified by Katz and Kahn (1978). By employing what is referred to as the Open System Model (OSM), basic film festival operation is seen to occur in a four-phase process in which the *importation* of resources is the first and most critical phase. Subsequent phases include the *transformation* and *output* of that resource, and these are followed by the *re-energisation* of the environment, which ultimately returns the cycle to the initial importation phase. In addition to these four characteristics, entropy is also identified as playing a crucial role in the basic functionality of film festival operation in that its inevitability requires film festival organisers to continually interact with the environment in order to replenish those resources transformed through operation. It is explained that not all film festivals are influenced by entropy in the same manner, or to the same degree. Thus entropic influence, in a manner similar to resource dependency, is conditional upon the individual needs of individual film festivals. Identification of aspects of entropic tendency is aided by its delineation according to three perceived drivers: operation, participation and finance.

Chapter Four expands upon the OSM through the formalisation of eight importation-based strategies understood to manipulate resource provider participation. It is explained that these strategies are designed so as to appeal to the perceptions of particular resource providers in an effort to promote a greater likelihood for interaction through their perceived and actual gratification. It is also noted that once again the effectiveness of each strategy is dependent upon a number of factors individual to each film festival. Therefore, the type, degree and total number of strategies employed by film festival organisers is best explored through festival-specific case studies. These strategies are:

Co-operative alliances, which represent a partnering between a film festival and another organisation to enable greater access to potential resource providers. In most cases the film festival fulfils a cinema-specific role.

Date placement, which refers to the dedication of a particular calendar date or dates during which the physical film festival is scheduled. The decision to place a film festival during a particular period of time may reflect upon its opportunities to gain greater access to resource provider participation.

Geographic location, which is the physical position of film festival, be it in a city, resort or small town (and even, as postulated by this study, online). The specific location of a film festival may enable its organisers to take advantage of resource monopolies and ultimately position their film festival as the authority within its given environment.

Identifiable function, which refers to the statement of the exact role or purpose a film festival will attempt to fulfil. The explicit statement of this strategy is used to promote participation by coding interaction according to perceived gratification potential so as to attract participation from those most likely to benefit from involvement.

Legitimising affiliations, which are categorised into five distinct groups: organisers, organisations, patrons/official guests, board of directors and sponsors. The strategy sees the association a film festival has with a particular group or individual as contributing to its overall perceived legitimacy and status, thus, again, potentially increasing the likelihood of resource importation.

Participation-based incentives, which are indicative of a direct appeal to the gratification-driven aspect of social system interaction. These strategies are designed to

increase the perceived benefits of interaction and provide a film festival with recognisable interaction-based advantages.

Resource control, which is a strategy employed to ensure a degree of operational stability. It sees resource providers developing a dependency upon the particular functional role of a film festival. Such an achievement is considered by this study to be the height of accomplishment for this specific strategy.

Sanctioning organisations, which are those entities such as the European Fantastic Film Festival Federation (EFFFF) that provide a film festival with legitimisation through membership, thereby providing greater access particular types of resource provider. Membership requirements often dictate additional terms with regard to operational protocol.

The identification of these strategies provides a structured and meaningful foundation from which to communicate detailed aspects pertaining to film festival operation. This feature is seen as a necessary adjunct to the next chapter in which five individual case studies are presented.

Chapter Five applies OSM to five, operationally diverse film festivals consisting of: the Denver International Film Festival, the Insect Fear Film Festival, the Shoot Out, the Haydenfilms Online Film Festival and the Gold Coast Film Fantastic. Each film festival represents a unique case study and is specifically chosen in order to demonstrate the general applicability of OSM to film festivals regardless of their size, scope, or focus. The first four case studies are representative of ‘snap shot’ analyses in which only particular open system conditions are examined.

The fifth and final case study is an assessment of the application of OSM concepts during a practical, fourteen-month film festival directorship conducted by the PhD Candidate. Through an open system analysis it is determined which functional aspects have led to the disorganisation of the Gold Coast Film Fantastic, and which strategies/operational modifications would need to be made in order to ensure re-activation.

These five case studies confirm that the theoretical components of film festival operation first identified in Chapter Two are in fact an implicit and intricate part of film festival operation which could ultimately be used in conducting a systemic examination. The major conceptual themes found in later chapters are also verified, and the application

of OSM is seen, in the case of the fifth case study, to successfully re-activate film festival operation and enable the completion of a successful cycle of operation.

The final chapter of this thesis discusses the overall and original contribution OSM can be seen to make to the study of film festivals.

Chapter Six concludes the study by re-addressing those factors understood to influence the effectiveness of academic research in film festival operation. It argues that through the OSM framework researchers are able to overcome source-based subjectivity, establish three characteristics representative of a formalised understanding of the term *film festival*, and utilise academically sound and established terminology as a means of discussing film festivals and film festival operation.

Chapter Six also identifies three specific areas of future research with regard to the open system model of operation, these being: investigation into the applicability and application of the remaining characteristics of open systems as identified by Katz and Kahn (1978); the development of empirically-based research that explains the open system conditions that influence resource importation, especially with degree to which film festival proliferation has the ability to saturate an environment and stifle operation; and the incorporation of OSM into those socially-complex aspects of resource provider participation which require the additional and more in-depth application of social and organisational theory.

Over the course of the previous six chapters an open system model (OSM) of operation has been presented as the likely choice through which such an understanding of basic film festival operation could be achieved. An open system model provides more, and more verifiable, formalised parameters by which a film festival's success or otherwise – in the form of its operational viability and propensity for longevity – may be thoroughly and objectively analysed and assessed. The fact that operation is based upon the importation of resources provides a logical and systematic means of analysing film festival functionality, regardless of the size, scope or focus of the individual event. There are overwhelming congruencies with actual film festival functionality, not least the inherent cyclical nature of operation, which both theoretically and pragmatically indicate the validity of proposing the conceptualisation of basic film festival operation according to an open system paradigm.

Appendices

Having taken into consideration the size and associated printing capabilities of this study, it was decided to present the Appendices in the form of an accompanying CD.

The CD features an autorun menu which should open up in the reader's browser after insertion of the disc. If the browser does not open the menu, it can be opened manually by opening the disc in Windows Explorer and double clicking the *index.htm* file.

The documents contained in these appendices fall into two parts.

The first four documents are interviews with Australian film industry professionals whose valuable insights contributed to the formulation of this study.

Next are those interviews conducted by the researcher with film festival organisers. The first four of these interviews form the basis for the case studies in Chapter Five. The remaining six were also conducted with the intention of providing their information as case studies. This is a project which the researcher has committed himself to undertaking at a future time.

Appendix One

- Interview with Michael Selwyn

Appendix Two

- Interview with Cathy Robinson

Appendix Three

- Interview with Ruth Saunders

Appendix Four

- Interview with Tracey Mair

Appendix Five

- Interview with Ron Henderson and Britta Erickson – Denver International Film Festival

Appendix Six

- Interview with Hayden Craddolph – Haydenfilms Online Film Festival

Appendix Seven

- Interview with Dr. May Berenbaum – Insect Fear Film Festival

Appendix Eight

- Interview with Teresa Conicella – The Shoot Out Film Festival

Appendix Nine

- Interview with Anne Demy-Geroe – Brisbane International Film Festival

Appendix Ten

- Interview with Ichiayama Shozo – Tokyo FilmeX Film Festival

Appendix Eleven

- Interview with Jed Cahill – In The Bin Film Festival

Appendix Twelve

- Interview with Akihito Nakakuki and Toshiharu Yamamoto –
JVC Tokyo Video Festival

Appendix Thirteen

- Interview with Gerry Fialka – PXL This Film Festival

Appendix Fourteen

- Interview with Seigo Tono – Short Shorts Film Festival

Primary References

- 48HFP (48-Hour Film Project) (2009). Official rules. *48-Hour Film Project*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.48hourfilm.com/filmmakers/rules-official.php>
- ABC (Australian Broadcasting Corporation) (2007). Figures reveal growing Gold Coast population. *abc.net.au*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from <http://www.abc.net.au/news/australia/qld/goldc/200702/s1859295.htm>
- Adewara, B. (1999, May 30). We are not interested in FESPACO now. *Sunday Vanguard*, p. 30, from http://books.google.com/books?id=rAUbyu1wRCsC&pg=PA182&lpg=PA182&dq=bola+adewara+we+are+not+interested+in+FESPACO+now&source=bl&ots=viCKJV21Zz&sig=QV1VSO-KxkP_0_sLWWiiYDCQhMA&hl=en&ei=B9biSrfcOdWfkQWY5oHLAQ&sa=X&oi=book_result&ct=result&resnum=1&ved=0CA0Q6AEwAA#v=onepage&q=bola%20adewara%20we%20are%20not%20interested%20in%20FESPACO%20now&f=false
- AFF (Art Film Fest) (2009). Record attendance at art film fest. *Artfilmfest.com*. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from <http://www.artfilmfest.sk/en/press/press/record-attendance-at-art-film-fest/>
- AFI (Australian Film Institute) (2009). About AFI. *The Australian Film Institute*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from <http://www.afi.org.au/AM/ContentManagerNet/HTMLDisplay.aspx?ContentID=8836&Section=About>
- AIMC (Australian International Movie Convention) (2009). About AIMC. *Australian International Movie Convention*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from http://www.movieconvention.com.au/page/About_AIMC/About_MPEAQ/
- Alexander, C. (1997). Dragons and tigers take on leopards and skunks: The importance of film festivals. *Performing Arts & Entertainment in Canada*, 31(2). Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m1319/is_n2_v31/ai_20348163/?tag=content;coll
- Allen, J., O'Toole, W., Harris, R. & McDonnell, I. (2008). *Festival and special event management*. Milton, Qld.: John Wiley & Sons Australia.

- Amdur, M. & Rooney, D. (2004, March 4). Preem dreams in Tribeca. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117901219.html>
- American Psychological Association. *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed). (2001). Washington, DC.
- AP (Associated Press) (2009, July 28). Hackers target Melbourne film festival. *The Independent*. Retrieved 17 December, 2009, from <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts-entertainment/films/news/hackers-target-melbourne-film-festival-1763507.html>
- Armatage, K. (2009). Toronto women & Film International. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 82-98.
- Aurora Asian Film Festival (AAFF) (2007). 2007 Festival summary. *Aurora Asian/Pacific Community Partnership website*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from http://auroraasian.org/AAFF/AAFF'07/FestivalSummary_1-pg.pdf
- Bangré, S. (1996) African Cinema in the Tempest of Minor Festivals. In Imruh Bakari and Mbye B. Cham (Eds.) *African experiences of cinema*. London: BFI, pp. 157-161.
- Bangré, S. (1996). African Cinema in the Tempest of Minor Festivals. In I. Bakari and M. B Chye (Eds.) *African Experiences in Cinema*. London: British Film Institute, pp. 157-161.
- Barlet, O. (1996). *African cinemas: Decolonizing the gaze* (C. Turner, Trans.). London: Zed Books Ltd.
- Barraclough, L. (2004, December 19). Scott, Breillat to lead Berlin sessions. *Variety*. Retrieved 19, November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915260.html?categoryid=1061&cs=1>
- Bart, P. (1997). *Cannes: fifty years of sun, sex & celluloid*. New York: Variety.
- Barton, J. & Selsky, J. W. (1998). *An open-system perspective on urban ports: An exploratory comparative analysis*. Paper presented at the Working Papers Series.
- Bazin, A. (2009). The festival viewed as a religious order. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 13-19.

- Beauchamp, C. & Behar, H. (1992). *Hollywood on the Riviera: The inside story of the Cannes Film Festival*. New York: William Morrow and Company, Inc.
- Benson, S. (1998). Mill Valley Film Festival (20th). In S. Gaydos (Ed.) *The Variety guide to film festivals: The ultimate insider's guide to film festivals around the world*. New York: Berkley Publ. Group, pp. 147-149.
- Berenbaum, M (2005). Insect Fear Film Festival: Interview with Researcher – via phone – 6 August 2005.
- Berenbaum, M. (1999). Insect Fear Film Festival Update... *Entomology Dept. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.life.illinois.edu/entomology/newsletter/newsltr1999/fearfilm.htm>
- Berenbaum, M. (2001). History of the Insect Fear Film Festival. *Entomology Graduate Student Update*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.life.illinois.edu/entomology/egsa/iffhistory.htm>
- Berlin Film Festival (BFF) (2009). Berlin Film Festival. *Berlinale*. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from <http://www.berlinale.de/en/HomePage.html>
- Berlinale (2009). WCF Profile. *Berlinale*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from http://www.berlinale.de/en/das_festival/world_cinema_fund/wcf_profil/index.html
- Birchenough, T. (2005, June 6). Moscow fest picks jury. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117923971.html>
- Biskind, P. (2004). *Down and Dirty Pictures: Miramax, Sundance and the rise of independent film*. New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks.
- BON (Box Office Network) (2009, August 13). International Film Festival Summit Announces Faculty for the Certified Film Festival Professional Program. *Box Office Network*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009 from <http://boxofficereport.com/a683250-international-film-festival-summit-announces-faculty.cfm>
- Boland, M. (2009a, July 20, 2009). Loach pulls 'Eric' from Melbourne. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1118006192.html?categoryid=13&cs=1&nid=25>

- Boland, M. (2009b, July 26, 2009). Hackers hit Melbourne fest site. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1118006502.html?categoryid=13&cs=1>
- Boulding, K. (1956). General systems theory: The skeleton of science. *Management Science*, April, 2(3), pp. 197-208.
- Brisbane Times (2008). Gold Coast United in box seat. *Brisbane TimesOnline*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from <http://www.brisbanetimes.com.au/news/sport/gold-coast-united-in-box-seat/2008/08/27/1219516554390.html>
- Broadbeach Alliance (2008). Broadbeach Alliance. *Broadbeach Gold Cost Distinctly Different*. Retrieved 15 December, 2009, from <http://broadbeachgc.com/broadbeach-alliance.html>
- Brooks, B. (2009, July 27). Botelho Takes Denver Film Society Reins. *IndieWire.com*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from http://www.indiewire.com/article/botelho_takes_denver_film_society_reins/
- Brooks, B. (2009, October 26). After Challenging Year, Denver Film Festival Sets 2009 Event. *IndieWire.com*., Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from http://www.indiewire.com/article/after_challenging_year_denver_film_festival_sets_2009_event/
- Brown, W. (2009). The festival syndrome. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 216-224.
- Burr, T. (2008, September 19). Bo Smith leaves the MFA for Denver Film Society. *Boston.com*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from http://www.boston.com/ae/movies/blog/2008/09/bo_smith_leaves.html
- Burton, N. (2005, July 7). Slamdance calls for entries. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925598.html>
- BusinessGC (2009). Sports Business Taskforce. *Business Gold Coast website*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from <http://businessgc.com.au/index.php?page=sport-organisations-2>
- Cahill, J. (2006). In the Bin Film Festival: Interview with Reasearcher – in person – 10 March, 2006.

- Carroll, N. & Choi, J. (Eds.). (2006). *Philosophy of film and motion pictures*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (2009, July 20). Loach pulls Melbourne festival film in Israeli funding protest. *CBC News*. Retrieved 17 December, 2009, from <http://www.cbc.ca/arts/film/story/2009/07/20/loach-israel.html>
- chaos (2007). Encyclopædia Britannica. *Encyclopædia Britannica 2007 Ultimate Reference Suite*. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.
- Cheung, R. (2009). Corporatising a film festival: Hong Kong. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 99-115.
- Clegg, S. R., Courpasson, D. & Phillips, N. (2006). *Power and organizations*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Conicella, T. (2005). The Shoot Out: Interview with Researcher – via phone – 6 October, 2005.
- Cousins, M. (2009). Widescreen on film festivals. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 155-158.
- Cowie, P. (Ed.). (2002). *Variety international film guide 2002*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Cowie, P. (Ed.). (2003). *Variety international film guide 2003*. London: Faber & Faber.
- Coyle, J. (2007). ‘Political festival’ primed to ‘Spidey 3’s’ U.S. debut. *Bucks County Courier Times*, pp. 1E- 4E
- Craddolph, H (2005). Haydenfilms Online Film Festival: Interview with Researcher – via phone – 16 January, 2005.
- Crawford, C. S. (2007). Actor network theory. In G. Ritzer (Ed.) *Blackwell encyclopedia of sociology*. USA: Sage, pp. 1-3.
- Crawford, P. I. & Turton, D. (Eds.). (1992). *Film as ethnography*. Manchester University Press.
- CUDenver (University of Colorado, Denver) (2008). Starz FilmCenter Denver. *University of Colorado Denver website*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://cam.cudenver.edu/partners/StarzFilmCenter/index.htm>

- Daft, R. L. (1997). *Management*. Fort Worth: Dryden Press.
- Daft, R. L. & Sharfman, M. P. (1990). *Organization theory: Cases and applications*. St. Paul, MN. West Publishing Company.
- Rooney, D. (1998). Venice International Film Festival. In S. Gaydos (Ed.) *The Variety guide to film festivals: The ultimate insider's guide to film festivals around the world*. New York: Berkley Publ. Group, pp. 120-122.
- Dawes, A. (1993, August 3). Chief out at Palm Springs Film Fest. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved 17 December, 2009, from http://articles.latimes.com/1993-08-03/entertainment/ca-19817_1_palm-springs-international-film-festival
- De La Fuente, A. M. (2004, March 21). Venice fest will have an American accent. *Variety*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117902002.html?categoryid=1611&cs=1>
- De La Fuente, A. M. (2006, October 2). L.A. Latino fest slates Gabi nod for Banderas. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951124.html>
- De Valck, M. & Loist, S. (2009). Film festival studies: An overview of a burgeoning field. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 179-215.
- De Valck, M. (2007). *Film festivals: From European geopolitics to global cinephilia*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Deauville American Film Festival (DAFF) (2009). Deauville American Films Festival is an event opened to all. *Deauville American Film Festival website*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from http://www.festival-deauville.com/GB/accueil_GB.php
- Demy-Geroe, A. Brisbane International Film Festival: Interview with Researcher – in person – 7 August, 2006.
- Denerstein, R. (2002). Denver Internation Film Festival. In P. Cowie (Ed.) *Variety International Film Guide 2002*. London: Faber and Faber, p. 325-334.
- Denver (2000, November 28). Denver's film industry gets a boost. *Denver Business Journal*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://denver.bizjournals.com/denver/stories/2000/11/27/daily5.html>

- Denver Center (2009). History and General Information- About Us. *Denver Center for the Performing Arts website*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.denvercenter.org/page.cfm?ID=30=30349578>
- Devlin, P. (2008, October 4). Making a film is only half the battle. *Independent Magazine*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.independent-magazine.org/node/2106>
- DiMaggio, P. & Powell, W. (1988). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. In C. Milofsky (Ed.) *Community Organizations*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 77-99.
- Diorio, C. (2004, March 25). Stars power ShoWest end. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117902296.html>
- Drew, J. (2009). Bazaar dumped despite interest. *Local Gold Coast news: goldcoast.com.au*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from http://www.goldcoast.com.au/article/2009/05/12/77955_gold-coast-news.html
- Ebert, R. (1987). *Two weeks in the midday sun: A Cannes notebook*. New York: Andrews and McMeel.
- EFFFF (European Fantastic Film Festivals Federation) (2009). European Fantastic Film Festivals Federation. *Melies d'Or website*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from <http://www.melies.org/>
- eHow (2008) How to organize a film festival. *eHow.com*. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from http://www.ehow.com/how_135524_organize-film-festival.html
- Elley, D. & Hopewell, J. (2007, August 27). Cannes fest ups Thierry Fremaux. *Variety*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117970951.html>
- Elley, D. (1998) London Film Festival (41st). In S. Gaydos (Ed.) *The Variety guide to film festivals: The ultimate insider's guide to film festivals around the world*. New York: Berkley Publ. Group, pp. 169-170.
- Elley, D. (1998). Locarno International Film Festival (51st). In S. Gaydos (Ed.) *The Variety guide to film festivals: The ultimate insider's guide to film festivals around the world*. New York: Berkley Publ. Group, pp. 113-114.

- Elley, D. (2004, August 15). 'Private' pulls Locarno rank. *Variety*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909091.html?categoryid=1061&cs=1>
- Elsaesser, T. (2005). *European cinema: Face to face with Hollywood*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- EMBOK (Event Management Body of Knowledge) (n.d.) About EMBOK. *embok.org*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.embok.org/>
- Entomology Newsletter (1999). Insect Fear Film Festival Update... *Entomology Dept. University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.life.illinois.edu/entomology/newsletter/newsltr1999/fearfilm.htm>
- Erikson, B. (2004). Denver International Film Festival: Interview with Researcher – in person – 6 January, 2004.
- Festivals Australia (2009). Program guidelines and information: Round 29. *Australian Government Department of Environment, Water, Heritage and the Arts*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from http://www.arts.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0013/81022/FA_Project_Guidelines_and_Info_Round_29.pdf
- FFW (Film Festival World) (2008). Film festival world. *Filmfestivalworld.com*. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from <http://www.filmfestivalworld.com/>
- Fialka, G. (2005). PXL THIS: Interview with Researcher – via phone – 25 October, 2005.
- FIAPF (Fédération Internationale des Associations de Producteurs de Films) (2008). International film festivals. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.fiapf.org/intfilmfestivals.asp>
- film festival (2009, November 14). In *Wikipedia, The free encyclopedia*. Retrieved November 16, 2009, from http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Film_festival&oldid=325820966
- FIPRESCI (Fédération Internationale de la Presse Cinématographique) (2009). Statutes. *FIPRESCI*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.fipresci.org/about/statutes.htm>

- Flickerfest (2009). 2010 Entry form. *Flickerfest*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://entryform2010.flickerfest.com.au/index.php/entry/new>
- Foundas, S. (2005, January 27). Fest coming of age. *Variety*. Retrieved 17 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917048.html?categoryid=1237&cs=1&query=Fest+Coming+of+Age+>
- Frater, P. (2005, July 17). Skip City digital fest unspools in Sapporo. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117926052.html>
- Frater, P. (2006, October 11). Beyond borders. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951695.html>
- Galaskiewicz, J. & Rauschenbach, B. (1988). The Corporation-Culture Connection: A Test of Interorganizational Theories. In C. Milofsky (Ed.) *Community Organizations*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 119-135.
- Gamson, J. (1996). The organizational shaping of collective identity: The case of lesbian and gay film festivals in New York. *Sociological Forum*, 11(2), 30.
- Garcelon, A. (2005, December 15). The charitable cursor. *Variety*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117934729.html?categoryid=2031&cs=1>
- Gaydos, S. (2005, February 8). Ex-Venice topper annexes Montreal gig. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917653.html>
- Gaydos, S. (Ed.). (1998). *The Variety guide to film festivals: an insider's guide to film festivals around the world* (1st ed.). New York: The Berkley Publishing Group.
- GCCC (Gold Coast City Council) (2006). Gold Coast business survey: Sport 2006. *Gold Coast City Council website*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from http://www.goldcoast.qld.gov.au/attachment/EDMP/GCBS_Sport_2006.pdf
- GCFF (Gold Coast Film Fantastic) (1997a). *Meeting Document*. Gold Coast, Queensland: Gold Coast Film Fantastic.
- GCFF (Gold Coast Film Fantastic) (1997b). *Discussion Report*. Gold Coast, Queensland: Gold Coast Film Fantastic.

- GCMIA (Gold Coast Music Industry Association) (2009). About Us. *Gold Coast Music Industry Association*. Retrieved 15 December, 2009, from <http://www.gcmia.org.au/cmlib/smartyindex.php?pageseq=74>
- George, S. (2002, March 21). Queensland funds Warner Roadshow Studio expansion. *ScreenDaily.com*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from <http://www.screendaily.com/queensland-funds-warner-roadshow-studio-expansion/408694.article>
- Getz, D. (2007). *Event studies: Theory, research and policy for planned events*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Gilmore, G. (2009, January 12). Evolution v. revolution, the state of independent film & festivals. *indiewire.com*. Retrieved 17 December, 2009, from http://www.indiewire.com/article/first_person/
- Globe Entertainment (2001). *Interim Report*. Brisbane: Gold Coast Film Fantastic
- Gold Coast (2009). Shopping & markets. *Goldcoast.com.au*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from <http://www.goldcoast.com.au/gold-coast-shopping-markets.html>
- Gold Coast HSD (2003). Gold Coast HSD - Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Population Profile 2001. *Queensland Health Department*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from http://www.health.qld.gov.au/multicultural/health_workers/hsdcald_profiles/goldcoastHSD.pdf
- Gold Coast Tourism (2009, May 12). Key statistics. *Very Gold Coast website*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from <http://www.verygoldcoast.com.au/about-gc/key-statistics/>
- Google (2009). Warner Roadshow Studios timeline. *Google.com*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from http://www.google.com/search?q=warner+roadshow+studios&hl=en&rls=com.microsoft:en-US&sa=X&tbo=p&tbs=tl:1,tll:1991/01,tlh:1991/12&ei=3HIQS_DhHZTs7APhnf3YBQ&oi=timeline_histogram_main&ct=timeline-histogram&cd=2&ved=0CBQQyQEoAg

- Gore, C. (2001). *The ultimate film festival survival guide* (2nd Ed.). Hollywood: Lone Eagle Publishing Company.
- Graydon, D. (2004, October 17). 'Nobody' tops Flanders fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117912079.html?categoryid=1061&cs=1>
- Grusky, O. (1963). The effects of formal structure on managerial recruitment: A study of baseball organization. *Sociometry*, 26(3), 345-353.
- Haberski, R. J. (2001). *It's only a movie!* Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky.
- Hamid, R. (2009). From urban Bohemia to Euro glamour: The establishment and early years of The New York Film Festival. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 67-80.
- Harbord, J. (2009). Film festivals-time-event. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 40-46.
- Harris, D. (2004a, March 14). Focus on films in Austin. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117901675.html?categoryid=13&cs=1>
- Harris, D. (2004b, September 19). Fests test if pix click. *Variety*. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from www.variety.com/article/VR1117910573.html
- Harris, D. (2005, January 24). Fest beset by party monster. *Variety*. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916857.html?categoryid=1238&cs=1>
- Harris, D. & Brendan, K. (2004, September 12). Toronto plays (very) nice. *Variety*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910292.html?categoryid=19&cs=1>
- Harris, T. E. & Nelson, M. D. (2008). *Applied organizational communication: Theory and practice in a global environment*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Haydenfilms (2004). Haydenfilms strategies for success. *Haydenfilms.com*. Retrieved 20 September, 2007, from <http://www.haydenfilms.com/about> [No longer online]

- Hays, M. (2003, August 24). Battle behind the scenes. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117891416.html?categoryid=1061&cs=1>
- Henderson, R. (2004). Denver International Film Festival: Interview with Researcher – in person – 6 January, 2004.
- Hendrix, G. (2005). So, you want to start a film festival...DON'T. *Slate.com*. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from <http://slate.msn.com/id/2120867/>
- Herskovitz, J. (1998). Tokyo International Film Festival (10th). In S. Gaydos (Ed.) *The Variety guide to film festivals: The ultimate insider's guide to film festivals around the world*. New York: Berkley Publ. Group, pp. 166-167.
- Holland, J. & Hopewell, J. (2006). Haute auteurs walk the beach. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009 <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950549.html>).
- Hope, C. (2004). *A History of the Sydney and Melbourne Film Festivals, 1945-1972: Negotiating between culture and industry*. Univertisty of Canberra, Canberra.
- Huang, Y. S. (2003). Creating and distributing films openly: on the relationship between women's film festivals and women's rights movement in Taiwan. *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 4(1), 157-158.
- Huber, C. (2009). Status quo and beyond: The Viennale, a success story. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 131-142.
- IFFS (International Film Festival Summit) (2009). Summit Conference. *Internatinal Film Festival Summit website*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.filmfestivalsummit.com/>
- Inglis, L. & Minahan, S. (2006). *Stakeholders and Strategic Planning: Experiences of an Australian Nonprofit organization 1993-2001*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009 from http://www.sba.muohio.edu/abas/2001/Quebec/Inglis_StakeholdersandStrategicPlanninginNPOs.pdf (Accessed, August 11 2006)
- Iordanova, D. & Rhyne, R. (2009). Introduction. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 1-5.

- Iordanova, D. & Rhyne, R. (Eds.) (2009). *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee.
- Iordanova, D. (2009). The festival circuit. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 23-38.
- James, A. & Nesselson, L. (2004, September 12). 'Grace' gets Deauville nod. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910311.html>
- Johnson, B. D. (2000). *Brave films wild nights - 25 years of festival fever*. Random House Canada.
- JVC (2008). Financial Section for JVC. *JVC Kenwood Annual Report 2008*. Japan: JVC Kenwood Holdings Inc. 2008 Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from http://www.jk-holdings.com/en/ir/library/annual/data/jkh_ar_2008_en_cps.pdf
- Kalina, P. (Ed.) (2001). *A place to call home: Celebrating 50 years of the Melbourne International Film Festival*. Melbourne: Melbourne International Film Festival.
- Katz, D. & Kahn, R.L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kelly, B. (2004, December 12). Fest fight going to court: Lawsuit demands \$2.1 million in damages from Telefilm. *Variety*. Retrieved 17 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117914870.html?categoryid=22&cs=1>
- Kelly, B. (2004, September 7). Canucks clamor for Montreal alternative. *Variety*. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910071.html>
- Kennedy, L. (2009, June 4). 21 resign in Denver Film Society shakeup. *Denverpost.com*, Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from http://www.denverpost.com/movies/ci_12520398
- Kerkinos, D. (2009). Programming Balkan films at the Thessaloniki International Film Festival. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 168-175.

- Kim, S. (2008). JVC, Kenwood to merge under JVC holdings. *Engadget.com*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.engadget.com/2008/05/12/jvc-kenwood-to-merge-under-jvc-holdings/>
- Klady, L. (1998). Chicago International Film Festival (33rd). In S. Gaydos (Ed.) *The Variety guide to film festivals: The ultimate insider's guide to film festivals around the world*. New York: Berkley Publ. Group, pp. 152-154.
- Koehler, R. (2009). Cinephilia and Film Festivals. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 81-97.
- Kriedemann, K. (2009, July 16). Durban film festival turns 30. *Variety*. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1118006101.html?categoryid=13&cs=1>
- Langer, A. (2000). *The film festival guide*. Chicago: Chicago Review Press.
- Loist, S. & de Valck, M. (2008) Film festivals/Film festival research: Thematic, annotated bibliography. *Film Festival Research Network*. Universitiy of Hamburg. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from http://www1.uni-hamburg.de/Medien/berichte/arbeiten/0091_08.html
- Macdonald, D. (1998). How to launch a community fest. In S. Gaydos (Ed.) *The Variety guide to film festivals: The ultimate insider's guide to film festivals around the world*. New York: Berkley Publ. Group, pp. 35-44.
- Macnab, G. (2009, September 28). Zurich Film Festival stunned by Polanski arrest. *Screen Daily*. Retrieved 17 December, 2009, from <http://www.screendaily.com/festivals/other-festivals/festival-news/zurich-film-festival-stunned-by-polanski-arrest/5006129.article>
- Mair, T. (2006) Interview with Reasearcher – via phone – 12 September, 2006.
- Martin, A. (2009). Here and elsewhere (the view from Australia). In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 98-106.
- Martin, C. (2009, April 10). Colorado film festivals ready to roll. *Denver Post*. Retrieved November 18, 2009, from http://www.denverpost.com/search/ci_13479928

- Masters, C. (2004, August 24). Fests play by new rules. *The Hollywood Reporter.com*, Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from http://www.hollywoodreporter.com/hr/search/article_display.jsp?vnu_content_id=1000617218
- Mayorga, E. (2006). Madrid sets up new film festival. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117955572.html>
- McCarthy, T. (1997). Introduction. In P. Bart (Ed.) *Cannes: fifty years of sun, sex & celluloid*. New York: Berkley Publ. Group, pp. 11-17.
- McCarthy, T. (1998). Santa Barbara International Film Festival (13th). In S. Gaydos (Ed.) *The Variety guide to film festivals: The ultimate insider's guide to film festivals around the world*. New York: Berkley Publ. Group, pp. 67-68.
- McCarthy, T. (2004, November 29). Sundance stepping to an int'l rhythm. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=story&articleid=VR1117914097&categoryid=1236&cs=1>
- Meyer, J. W. & Rowan, B. (1983). Institutionalized organizations : Formal structure as myth and ceremony. In J. W. Meyer, B. Rowan, W. R. Scott and T. E. Deal (Eds.) *Organizational environments: Ritual and rationality*. USA: Sage, pp. 21-44.
- Meyer, J. W., Scott, W. R., Rowan, B. & Deal, T. E. (1983). *Organizational environments - ritual and rationality*. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications.
- Meza, E. (2009, Apr. 30). VW backs out of Berlin sponsorship. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=festivals&jump=story&id=2476&articleid=VR1118003019>.
- Milofsky, C. (Ed.). (1988). *Community organizations studies in resource mobilization and exchange*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mohr, I. (2005, February 6). Rendez-vous ready. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917516.html>
- Möller, O. (2009). Bagatelle for Kino Otek and i 1000 occhi. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 143-150.

- Morgan, S. (2009, March 17). The (R)evolution of Filmmaking: A Look at Online Festivals. *Independent Magazine*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.independent-magazine.org/magazine/2009/03/onlinefests>
- Nakakuki, A. (2005). JVC Tokyo Video Festival: Interview with Researcher – in person – 27 April, 2005.
- NCC (Newcastle City Council) (2009). Newcastle statistics. *Newcastle City Council*. Retrieved December 15, 2009, from http://www.newcastle.nsw.gov.au/discover_newcastle/newcastle_statistics
- Nesselson, L. (1997). The untanned press: Esprit to the corps. In P. Bart (Ed.) *Cannes: fifty years of sun, sex & celluloid*. New York: Variety, pp. 44-47.
- Pajee, P. (2009). BIFF downsized, to focus on Asian films. *The Nation*. Retrieved, 16 November, 2009, from <http://www.nationmultimedia.com/worldhotnews/30038343/BIFF-downsized,-to-focus-on-Asian-films>
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. New York: Free Press.
- Peranson, M. (2008). First you get the power, then you get the money: Two models of film festivals. *Cineaste* 33(3), pp. 37-43.
- Peranson, M. (2009). First you get the power, then you get the money: Two models of film festivals. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 23-37.
- Pfeffer, J. & Salancik, G. R. (2003). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependency perspective*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Poirier, A. (2003). Montreal festival deprived of 'A-list' status. *Screen Daily.com*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.screendaily.com/montreal-festival-deprived-of-a-list-status/4013701.article>
- Porton, R. (2009a). A director on the festival circuit: An interview with Atom Egoyan. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 169-181.
- Porton, R. (2009b). Introduction: On film festivals. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 1-9.
- Porton, R. (Ed.). (2009). *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press.

- pragmatism (2007). Encyclopædia Britannica. *Encyclopædia Britannica 2007 Ultimate Reference Suite*. Chicago: Encyclopædia Britannica.
- Pratley, G. & Klady, L. (1998). A short history of international film festivals. In S. Gaydos (Ed.) *The Variety guide to film festivals: The ultimate insider's guide to film festivals around the world*. New York: Berkley Publ. Group, pp. 1-6.
- Quandt, J. (2009). The sandwich process: Simon Field talks about polemics and poetry at film festivals. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 53-80.
- Queensland Events (2009). Events Calendar. *Queensland Events*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from <http://www.qldevents.com.au/events/details.php?eventId=860&r=6&et=1>
- Quintín (2009). The festival galaxy. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 38-52.
- Ran, M. (2009). Rethinking festival film: Urban generation Chinese cinema on the film festival circuit. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 116-135.
- RDA (Riding for the Disable Association) (2009). Homepage. *Riding for the Disabled Association of Australia Limited*. Retrieved 15 December, 2009, from <http://www.rda.org.au/>
- Rhyne, R. (2009). Film festival circuits and stakeholders. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 9-22.
- Rithdee, K. (2009). The sad case of the Bangkok Film Festival. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 123-130.
- RMN (Rocky Mountain News) (2005). Pulling the strings. *Rocky Mountain News website*. Retrieved 25 September, 2006, from <http://cfapp.rockymountainnews.com/entertainment/top25/2005/> [No longer online]
- Robinson, C. (2006). Interview with Researcher – in person – 22 April, 2006.

- Roddick, N. (2009). Coming to a server near you: The film festival in the age of digital reproduction. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 159-167.
- Roelofs, L. (2008). Open systems concepts. *Organizational change*. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from <http://www.soi.org/reading/change/concepts.shtml>
- Rose, A. (2002). The Art of Appreciation. *Movie Maker*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from http://www.moviemaker.com/articles/article/the_art_of_appreciation_3381/
- Rosenbaum, J. (2009). Some festivals I've known: A few rambling recollections. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 151-165.
- Rüling, C. (2009). Festivals as field-configuring events: The Annecy International Animated Film Festival and Market. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 49-66.
- Saunders, R. (2006). Interview with Researcher - via phone - 18 December, 2006.
- SCFD (Scientific & Cultural Facilities District) (2007). Welcome. *scfd.org*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.scfd.org/>
- Screen Australia (2009). Marketing your film. *Screen Australia*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.afc.gov.au/marketingyourfilm/default.aspx>
- SECOR (SECOR Consulting) (2004). *Analysis of Canada's Major Film Festivals*. Montreal: Secor Consulting.
- Selwyn, M. (2006). Interview with Researcher – in person – 24 August, 2006.
- Svenson, M. (2001). How to start your own film festival. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from <http://www.koreanfilm.org/startfest.html>
- Shoot Out (2009). Guestfilmmaker... *Shoot Out*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.theshootout.info/Newcastle/guestfilms.html>
- Shoot Out (2009). Judging... *Shoot Out*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.theshootout.info/Newcastle/judges.html>
- Shozo, I. (2005). Tokyo FilmeX: Interview with Researcher – in person – 27 April, 2005.

- Slocum, J. D. (2009). Film and/as culture: The use of cultural discourses at two African film festivals. In D. Iordanova and R. Rhyne (Eds.) *Film festival yearbook 1: The festival circuit*. St. Andrews, Scotland: Pontaprint Dundee, pp. 136-152.
- Smith, D. (1990), Textually mediated social organisation. *Text, facts and femininity: Exploring the relations of ruling*. London: Routledge, pp. 209-224.
- Smith, L. (1999). *Party in a box: The story of the Sundance Film Festival*. Salt Lake City: Gibbs Smith.
- Softpedia (2006). Robert De Niro's film festival in New York has begun! *Softpedia.com*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://news.softpedia.com/news/Robert-De-Niro-039-s-film-festival-in-New-York-has-begun-22114.shtml>
- SPAA (Screen Producers Association of Australia) (2009). About SPAA. *Screen Producers Association of Australia*. Retrieved 14 December, 2009, from <http://www.spaa.org.au/displaycommon.cfm?an=3>
- Starnes, B. J. (2000). Achieving competitive advantage through the application of open systems theory and the development of strategic alliances: A guide for managers of nonprofit organizations. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 8(2), pp. 15-27.
- Starz (2005a). Press Room – media release. *Starz Entertainment Media Room*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www2.prnewswire.com/cgi-bin/stories.pl?ACCT=105&STORY=/www/story/11-28-2000/0001374726>
- Starz (2005ab). Starz Entertainment Group Historic Timeline. *Stars Entertainment Media Room*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://starz.mediaroom.com/index.php?s=51>
- Stolberg, S. (Ed.). (2000). *International film festival guide*. Toronto: Festival Products.
- Stone, M. (1999). Challenging cultural categories: the transformation of the Venice Biennale under Fascism. In “Challenging Cultural Categories: The Transformation of the Venice Biennale Under Fascism,” *Journal of Modern Italian Studies*, 4(2).
- Stone, M. (2002). The last film festival: The Venice Biennale goes to war. In J. Reich and P. Garofalo (Eds.) *Re-viewing fascism: Italian cinema 1922-1943*. USA: Indiana University Press, pp. 293-313.

- Stringer, J. (2001). Global cities and the international film festival economy. In M. Shiel and T. Fitzmaurice (eds.) *Cinema and the city: Film and urban societies in a global context*. London: Blackwell Publishers Inc., pp. 134-144.
- Stringer, J. (Ed.). (2003). *Movie blockbusters*. London: Routledge.
- Sydney Film Festival (1992). *40 years of film: an oral history of the Sydney Film Festival*. Sydney: Sydney Film Festival.
- system (1997). Macquarie Dictionary definition. In A. Delbridge *et al.* (Eds.) *The Macquarie Dictionary*. North Rhyde, NSW: Macquarie Library.
- Tanner, L. R. (2009). *Creating film festivals: Everything you wanted to know but didn't know who to ask*. Oakland: Lauri Rose Tanner (self-published).
- Taylor, V. & Whittier, N. (1992). Collective identity in social movement communities. In A. Morris and C. Mueller (Eds.), *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Telefilm (2009). Festivals and markets. *Telefilm Canada*. Retrieved 17 November, 2009, from <http://74.125.153.132/search?q=cache:JdyLcFg5ykJ:www.telefilm.gc.ca/05/51.asp%3Fflang%3Den%26+see%27s+to+it+that+Canadian+productions+are+represented+at+more+than+300+Canadian+festivals+and+foreign+events&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk>
- Telluride Film Festival (2009). History – 1st festival 1974. *Telluride Film Festival website*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://telluridefilmfestival.org/photoscroller.html>
- Teo, T. (2009). Asian film festivals and their diminishing glitter domes: An appraisal of PIFF, SIFF and HKIFF. In R. Porton (Ed.) *Dekalog3 on film festivals*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 109-121.
- The Filmlot (2006). The Filmlot Fest Blog: Resources for new and independent film makers. *thefilmlot.com*. Retrieved 16 November, 2009, from <http://thefilmlot.com>
- Tolbert, P. S. & Zucker, L. G. (1983). Institutional sources of change in the formal structure of organizations: The diffusion of civil service reform, 1880 - 1935. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 28, 22-39.

- Tono, S. (2005). Short Shorts Film Festival: Interview with Researcher – in person – 29 August, 2005.
- Tropfest (2008). Signature item. *Tropfest.com*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.tropfest.com/au/SignatureItem.aspx>
- Turan, K. (2002). *Sundance to Sarajevo: Film festivals and the world they make*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- TVF (2009). The 31st JVC Tokyo Video Festival 2009 - TVF 2009 Report. *Victor Japan website*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from http://www.jvc-victor.co.jp/english/tvf/tvf2009/pdf/tvf2009report_en.pdf
- Victor (2008). Tokyo Video Festival. *Victor Japan website*. Retrieved 27 November, 2009, from <http://www.victor.co.jp/english/tvf/abouttvf/concept.html>
- VIFC (Vancouver International Film Center) (2008). VIFF mandate and acknowledgements. *Vancouver International Film Center*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.vifc.org/about/about.htm>
- Vivarelli, N. (2004, April 28). H'wood signs on Lido. *Variety*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117903961.html>.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1950). An outline of general systems theory. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 1(2), 134-165.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory: foundations, development, applications*. Edmonton University of Alberta.
- Von Bertalanffy, L. (1972). The history and status of general systems theory. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 15(4), 407-426.
- Walker, S. (2000). *King of Cannes: madness, mayhem and the movies*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Wall, J. M. (2009, March 20). Ron Holloway finds “political movies” at the 2009 Berlin Festival. *Wallwritings.wordpress*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from <http://wallwritings.wordpress.com/2009/03/20/ron-holloway-finds-political-movies-at-the-2009-berlin-festival/>
- Webber, P. (2005). *History of the Sydney Film Festival*. Unpublished Masters thesis, University of Technology Sydney.

- Yamamoto, T. (2005). JVC Tokyo Video Festival: Interview with Researcher – in person – 27 April, 2005.
- Zazaruk, E. (2004). Cracow film festival, Poland, June 2004. *Norsk Filmklubbforbund*. Retrieved 19 November, 2009, from http://www.filmklubb.no/?s=ifffs&m=ifffs_reports&id=1291
- Zhang, Y. (2002). *Screening China*. Michigan, USA: Center for Chinese Studies – The University of Michigan.

Secondary References

- Allen, R. (1995). *Projecting Illusion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Amdur, M. (2004, April 28). Blockbuster dives into subs. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117903992.html>
- Ault, S. (2006, October 10). Warner adjusts HD/Blu-ray sales projections. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951660.html>
- Barracough, L. (2004, December 28). Brit youths wear shorts. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915504.html>
- Barracough, L. (2005, January 18). Fest hatches 'Hitch'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916504.html>
- Bensinger, K. (2005, February 27). 'Turtles' snaps up top Mexico nods. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918616.html?categoryid=1043&cs=1>
- Bing, J. (2004, November 10). Fest Thais one on. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117913387.html>
- Birchenough, T. (2004, June 27). Moscow fest's local hero. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117907093.html>
- Birchenough, T. (2005, June 19). Moscow fest helps promote local biz. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924731.html>
- Birchenough, T. (2005, June 29). Local pic's Moscow laurel draws fire. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925311.html>
- Blau, P. M. (1970). A formal theory of differentiation in organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 35(2), pp. 201-218.
- Brodesser, C. & Swart, S. (2004, August 18). Russian 'Watch' man welcomed at Fox. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909286.html>
- Burch, N. (1973). *Theory of film practice*. London: Praeger Publishers.

- Chang, J. (2005, July 4). Loyola looks outside. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925450.html>
- Chang, J. (2006, September 26). Oscar deadlines approach. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950743.html>
- Child, B. (2009, July 15). Rebiya Kadeer row engulfs Melbourne film festival. *Guardian Online*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/film/2009/jul/15/rebiya-kadeer-melbourne-film-festival>
- Cohen, D. S. (2005, July 6). ClickStar clicking with internet pix. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925541.html>
- Cook, K. S. & Whitmeyer, J. M. (1992). Two approaches to social structure: Exchange theory and network analysis. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18, pp. 109-127.
- Coonan, C. (2005). It's growth oriented. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918335.html>
- Coonan, C. (2005, July 25). China OK's private coin for digital. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117926472.html>
- Coonan, C. (2006). China limits online music. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117955689.html>
- Coonan, C. (2006). Confusion over Chinese regulations. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117955824.html>
- Dawtre, A. (2004, February 5). 'Skull' session. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117899653.html>
- Dawtre, A. (2004, May 6). Iranian censors say forget 'Amnesia'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117904454.html>
- Dawtre, A. (2005, February 13). Berlin's a big deal. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917900.html>
- Dawtre, A. (2005, February 17). Berlin 'Night' vision. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918138.html>
- Dawtre, A. (2005, February 28). Pledging allegiance. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918648.html>

- Dawtre, A. (2005, May 16). Jarmusch in bloom. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117922936.html>
- Dawtre, A. (2005, June 22). Warner pix up for VOD on FilmFlex. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924893.html>
- Dawtre, A. (2006, February 18). Growing mart keeps focus on art pix. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=features2006&content=jump&jump=story&dept=berlin&nav=Nberlin&articleid=VR1117938475>
- De La Fuente, A. M. (2004, March 3). Latino fest promotes pix for U.S. distrib. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117901117.html>
- Dempsey, J. (2005, January 4). Legit pic 'Embedded' on Sundance Channel. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915758.html>
- Dempsey, J. (2005, February 20). Cable keeps off competitish. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918231.html>
- Dempsey, J. (2005, June 9). 'Omagh' heads to S'dance net. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924196.html>
- Dempsey, J. (2005, June 13). Sundance deal a 'Beauty'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924360.html>
- Diorio, C. (2003, December 29). D.C. gets Landmark plex. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117897618.html>
- Diorio, C. (2004, March 21). Summer looks like a hot ticket. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117902008.html>
- Diorio, C. (2004, March 22). Exhibs sound alarm bell on global piracy. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117902059.html>
- Dunkley, C. (2004, October 26). AWP gives the devil his due. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117912560.html>

- Dunkley, C. (2005, January 17). Roadside Attractions spiced with 'Lavender'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916447.html>
- Dunkley, C. & Mohr, I. (2005, January 22). Redford: Fest over the top. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916741.html?categoryid=10&cs=1&query=redford%3A+fest+over+the+top>
- Dunkley, C. & Mohr, I. (2005, January 26). No biz like snow biz. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916979.html?categoryID=&cs=1>
- Edmunds, M. (2004, August 30). Fest promises Turkish restorations. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909774.html>
- Edmund, M. (2004, December 8). Rotterdam revs up. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117914662.html>
- Edmunds, M. (2005, January 4). Rotterdam's Tigers feast on world bows. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915736.html>
- Edmund, M. (2005, February 2). 3 land development coin at CineMart. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917306.html>
- Edmund, M. (2005, March 1). Coin hasn't solved EU film biz woes. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918720.html>
- Eisner, K. (2004, June 15). 'Windows' needled. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906496.html>
- Elley, D. (2004, February 9). Locarno sets career kudos. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117899826.html>
- Elley, D. (2004, July 26). Surprise 'Cut' highlights PiFan fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117908265.html>
- Elley, D. (2005, June 9). Pusan fest plans fireworks. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924158.html>

- Elley, D. (2005, June 16). Locarno chief unspools her resignation. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924594.html>
- Elley, D. (2005, May 21). Cannes wild about 'Child'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117923281.html>
- Elley, D. (2006). Berlin spreads out riches. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=features2006&content=jump&jump=story&dept=berlin&nav=Nberlin&articleid=VR1117938474>
- Frater, P. (2005, June 16). China plans media division IPO. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924627.html>
- Frater, P. (2005, June 20). 'Album' tops Shanghai fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924766.html>
- Fritz, B. (2004, January 8). Content in motion at CES. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117898072.html>
- Fritz, B. (2004, May 3). Emmys test online voting for first time. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117904255.html>
- Fritz, B. (2004, June 7). Report: Demand for VOD on rise. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906111.html>
- Fritz, B. (2004, June 13). Starz! gets Real via online service. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906382.html>
- Fritz, B. (2004, August 30). Mr. Smith goes to Hollywood. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909771.html>
- Fritz, B. (2004, November 4). Reeling in pic pirates. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117913062.html>
- Fritz, B. (2004, November 9). Amazon will book online promo shorts. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117913346.html>
- Fritz, B. (2004, December 29). Sony's Wiser about digital media future. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915547.html>
- Fritz, B. (2005, January 17). Intel's Revelations. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916479.html>

- Fritz, B. (2005, January 27). Study: Web piracy costing biz \$850 mil. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917029.html>
- Fritz, B. (2005, June 21). Duo project digital cinema effort. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924844.html>
- Fritz, B. (2005, June 22). Kodak links with Barco on d-cinema. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924896.html>
- Fritz, B. (2006, September 27). Jumpcut hops to Yahoo! *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950831.html>
- Gain, B. (2006, October 8). 'London' tops Dinard. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951525.html>
- Ganesan, S. (2004, July 29). Restricted 'Passion'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117908437.html>
- Garcelon, A. (2005, June 27). Student fest takes roll call. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925143.html>
- Gavrilova, M. (2009). Aleksey German JR.: The Paper Soldier's Land. *Action! Berline Special Edition*, p. 21.
- Gavrilova, M. (2009). On the Island with Aleksandr Rodnyansky. *Action!, Berlinale Special Edition*, p. 19.
- Geitz, C. (2004, June 6). Spanish shorts kicks off Huesca film fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906038.html>
- Geitz, C. (2004, August 24). Spanish film fest announces lineup. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909504.html>
- Goldsmith, J. & Frater, P. (2005, July 13). Great new wall. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925850.html>
- Goodfellow, M. (2006). 'Black' takes gold in Netherlands. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951623.html>
- Graser, M. (2004, April 19). Media.net boosts dailies. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117903531.html>

- Gray, T. M. (2004, June 9). Beating the Bushes in H'w'd. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906226.html>
- Gray, T. M. (2004, June 24). Oscar's halftime. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906992.html>
- Graydon, D. (2004, October 17). 'Nobody' tops Flanders fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117912079.html>
- Grey, T. (2006, September 24). Frears' master class. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950510.html>
- Grey, T. (2006, September 24). Upstart aspirations. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950511.html>
- Groves, D. (2004, February 11). 'Cold' is China dish with Miramax deal. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117899976.html>
- Groves, D. (2004, June 16). U.S. seeks to nix Chinese pic ban. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906593.html>
- Groves, D. (2004, November 9). Oz getting a taste of 'Greenlight'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117913269.html>
- Groves, D. (2005, February 1). WB's adding China plexes. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917247.html>
- Groves, D. (2005, February 22). Warners steps up China bid. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918346.html>
- Guerrasio, J. (2006, October 5). RESFEST prepping 43-city tour. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951373.html>
- Guider, E. (2004, March 25). Int'l biz bracing for reality. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117902298.html>
- Guider, E. (2004, June 14). TV confab turns into election platform. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906446.html>
- Guider, E. (2004, September 26). Flanders tunes tributes. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117911000.html>

- Guider, E. (2004, September 30). TV biz puts best hopes forward at Cannes mart. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117911218.html>
- Guider, E. (2006, May 22). Mipcom, Cannes team. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117965594.html>
- Hammer, T. H. (1979). Book Review: The Social Psychology of Organizations. *Social Forces*, 57(4), pp. 1413-1416.
- Harris, D. (2004, February 9). ‘Jersey Girl’ heads South. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117899838.html>
- Harris, D. (2004, May 25). Sundance taps 5 for grants. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117905584.html>
- Harris, D. (2004, June 17). ‘Brother’ at Wolfe’s door. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906651.html>
- Harris, D. (2004, August 18). Shorts suit Palm Springs. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909281.html>
- Harris, D. (2004, August 30). Indie nabbing ‘Nixon’. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909776.html>
- Harris, D. (2004, September 15). New lineup at artsy banner. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910478.html>
- Harris, D. (2004, October 3). Seventh to import ‘Remains’. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117911345.html>
- Harris, D. (2005, January 4). Wilsons’ debut to open SXSW. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915774.html>
- Harris, D. (2005, January 22). ‘Throat’ doc shows wide cultural impact. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916742.html?categoryid=10&cs=1&query=doc+shows+wide+cultural+impact> (pp. No URL).
- Harris, D. & Bing, J. (2004, May 31). Moore covets July 4th fireworks. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117905780.html>

- Harris, D. & Brendan, K. (2004, September 12). Toronto plays (very) nice. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910292.html>
- Harris, D. & Dunkley, C. (2004, January 18). Co-hosted ‘Garden’ party tops Dance deal blizzard. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117898668.html>
- Harris, D. & Dunkley, C. (2005, January 21). Miramax takes fest bite. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916718.html?categoryid=1958&cs=1>
- Harris, D. & Dunkley, C. (2005, January 25). Lions Gate sweet on ‘Candy’. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916923.html?categoryID=&cs=1>
- Harris, D. & Mohr, I. (2005, May 15). 2nd acts at Cannes. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117922873.html>
- Harris, D. & Rooney, D. (2004, June 1). ‘9/11’: Moore the merrier. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117905818.html>
- Hofler, R. (2004, June 15). Sundance Theater Lab slate goes international. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906506.html>
- Hofler, R. (2004, October 5). Tribeca Fest lines up ‘Downtown’ fare. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117911543.html>
- Hofmann, K. (2006). Styles vs. Substance. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=features2006&content=jump&jump=story&head=berlin&nav=Nberlin&articleid=VR1117938461&cs=1>
- Hopewell, J. (2004, July 8). Spanish fest seeks sales. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117907497.html>
- Hopewell, J. (2004, August 25). San Sebastian to bow ‘Fidel’ in full. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909577.html>
- Hopewell, J. (2004, September 20). Euro pix contending. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910696.html>

- Hopewell, J. (2004, October 4). Business is back. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117911456.html>
- Hopewell, J. (2004, December 6). All in family: Dramas top Gijon's fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117914456.html>
- Hopewell, J. (2005, June 6). 'Centimeters' measures up. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117923969.html>
- Hopewell, J. (2006, January 31). Madrid in spotlight at new confab. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117937141.html>
- Hopewell, J. & Dawtre, A. (2004, February 9). Euro mart big at Berlin. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117899841.html>
- Hopewell, J. & De La Fuente, A. M. (2005, February 22). 'Turtles' to open arty Mar de Plata fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918361.html>
- Hopewell, J. & Elley, D. (2006, August 27). Cannes fest ups Thierry Fremaux. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117970951.html>
- Hopewell, J. & Pablos, D. E. (2006, February 29). San Seb sparks int'l sales deals. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950967.html>
- Hopewell, J. & Young, D. (2004, September 19). Spain hails helmers. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910623.html>
- Hopewell, J. & Young, D. (2006, September 30). Pair share top spot in San Sebastian. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951071.html>
- Jacobson, L. (2005, June 19). Locals swarm huge Seattle fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924665.html>
- James, A. (2004, June 1). Monte Carlo fest tunes glamour, format forum. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117905801.html>

- James, A. (2004, June 19). Cannes, Reed bolster ties. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117911485.html>
- James, A. (2005, February 2). Cannes gala kids around. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917305.html>
- James, A. (2005, February 24). ‘Sideways’ helmer picked for jury duty. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918484.html>
- James, A. (2005, April 5). Festive feevee plan. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117920605.html>
- James, A. (2005, May 19). The ‘Hidden’ agenda. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117923196.html>
- James, A. (2005, June 20). Vet takes film post. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924769.html>
- James, A. & Meza, E. (2005, February 10). Fest shines in rain. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917765.html>
- James, A. & Nesselson, L. (2004, September 12). ‘Grace’ gets Deauville nod. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910311.html>
- Jennings, S. (2005, June 27). ‘Casanova’ succumbs to Venice fest charms. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925135.html>
- Jones, A. (2004, January 18). Warner Bros. Int’l pacts for more Chinese theatres. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117898679.html>
- Jones, A. (2004, June 13). Iranian pic tops Shanghai fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906378.html>
- Jones, A. (2005, June 19). Shanghai fest keeps its int’l flavour. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924668.html>
- Jones, A. (2005, July 12). China loves Lu’s pic as Oscar entry. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925779.html>

- Jones, M. (2007, August 23). Swerve Festival sets titles. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117970733.html>
- Kamin, D. & Fritz, B. (2004, September 13). CinemaNow pacts for VOD in Europe. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910355.html>
- Katz, F. E. (1979). Organizational theory and cultural intrusions into organizations. *American Sociological Review*, 44(4), 667-668.
- Katz, F. E. (1979). Review: Organizational theory and cultural intrusions into organizations. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from American Sociological Association: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2094594>
- Kelly, B. (2004, June 8). Canuck 'Fahrenheit' rights to Alliance. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906171.html>
- Kelly, B. (2004, July 29). Embattled Montreal gives peek at slate. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117908439.html>
- Kelly, B. (2004, August 23). Toronto fest blitzed by Hollywood glitz. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909457.html>
- Kelly, B. (2004, August 25). Last stop for Montreal? *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909580.html>
- Kelly, B. (2004, September 14). Fest fare beating the Bushies. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910420.html>
- Kelly, B. (2004, September 15). Early exits at Toronto. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910490.html>
- Kelly, B. (2004, September 20). Losique lets fly at funders' fest plan. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910691.html>
- Kelly, B. (2004, September 28). Montreal fest reveals lineup, ignores rival. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117911063.html>
- Kelly, B. (2004, October 31). Montreal's Recall. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117912793.html>

- Kelly, B. (2004, December 12). Fest fight going to court. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117914870.html>
- Kelly, B. (2004, December 19). Montreal's fest faceoff favors vets. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915252.html>
- Kelly, B. (2004, December 7). Jury prexy for Montreal fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117914585.html>
- Kelly, B. (2005, February 10). Quebec fest fracas. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917739.html>
- Kelly, B. (2005, February 21). Montreal fests to spar in court. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918308.html>
- Kelly, B. (2005, March 3). De Hadeln targets H'wood connection. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918855.html>
- Kelly, B. (2006, March 30). Montreal festival bounces back. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117970952.html>
- Kelly, B. (2005, March 30). 'Murderball' opens Hot Docs festival. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117920287.html>
- Kelly, B. (2005, July 5). Fest married to 'Wedding'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925473.html>
- Kelly, B. (2006, October 3). Riches for Nouveau fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951199.html>
- Kelly, B. & Elley, D. (2004, September 6). 'Bride' chosen but will fest be jilted? . *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910031.html?categoryid=13&cs=1&query=>
- Kennedy, L. (2007, February 2). Party, festival, market – this is Sundance. *Denver Post*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from http://www.denverpost.com/ci_5129839?source=rss
- Kingsley, S. (2006, February 17). Talent Campus wraps on high note with Warbeck. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=features2006&content=jump&jump=story&dept=berlin&nav=Nberlin&articleid=VR1117938471>

- Koehl, C. (2004, June 6). Munich fetes helmers. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906084.html>
- Koehl, C. (2005, June 29). World Cinema Fund backs Latam title. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925331.html>
- Koehl, C. (2005, July 18). Fantasy tour for preem pix. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117926111.html>
- Koehl, C. (2004, October 14). Hofer fest fetes McNaughton, Barrish. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117912016.html>
- Koehl, C. (2004, December 29). Berlin boards 'Ship'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915528.html>
- Laporte, N. (2005, February 10). Laugh fest snowballs. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917801.html>
- Laporte, N. (2005, February 13). Aspen event living large. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917928.html>
- Lasansky, M. D. (2004). *The Renaissance perfected: Architecture, spectacle, and tourism in Fascist Italy*: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Lazaruk, E. (2004). Cracow film festival, Poland, June 2004. *International Federation of Film Societies*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from http://www.filmklubb.no/IFFS.php?id=1291&t=iffs_reports
- Lipschultz, D. (2000). Flood of film festivals. *Internet World*, 6(10), pp. 35-39.
- Livingstone, S. (Ed.). (2005). *Audience and publics: When cultural engagement matters for the public sphere*. Bristol, GBR: Intellect Books.
- Lowenstein, L. (2005, January 31). Variety femme fest panel pushes passion. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917203.html?categoryid=13&cs=1>
- Lundberg, P. (2006, September 29). Lights go out in Reykjavik. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from [http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950968.html?categoryid=1117950919&cs=](http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950968.html?categoryid=1117950919&cs=1)

- Lundberg, P. (2006, September 29). Norway sends 'Reprise' to Oscars. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950962.html>
- Macdonald, K. M. (1986). Book reviews: Meyer, John W. and W. Richard Scott (1983) *Organizational environments: Ritual and Rationality*. *International Social Work*, 29(3), pp. 272-273.
- Martin, D. (2003, August 18). Cable coin key for title wave. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117891047.html?categoryid=1667&cs=1>
- Mast, G. & Marshall, C. (Eds.) (1974). *Film theory and criticism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mayorga, E. (2006, September 28). 'Bride' marches off with Progress kudo. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950865.html>
- McCarthy, T. (2004). Telluride stirs heady pic mix. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910033.html>
- McCarthy, T. (2006, January 22). The fast and the furious. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=features2006&content=jump&jump=story&head=sundance&nav=NSundance&articleid=VR1117936602&cs=1&query=The+fast+and+the+furious>
- McClintock, P. (2005, February 1). TV fest fosters new talent. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917253.html>
- McClintock, P. (2005, March 3). Tribeca, Amazon link. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918850.html>
- McClintock, P. (2006, October 3). AFI festival lineup is loaded. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951210.html>
- McClintock, P. (2006, October 4). AFM titles trickling out. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951310.html>

- McClintock, P. & Mohr, I. (2006, January 24). 'Listener' speaks to Miramax. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117936756.html?categoryid=13&cs=1>
- McLean, G. N. (2006). *Organization development: Principles - processes - performance*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- McNary, D. (2004, August 8). Newman, Logan draw fest honors. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117908789.html>
- McNary, D. (2004, August 31). H'wood fest to fete pair. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909875.html>
- McNary, D. (2006, October 10). 'Flicka' rides to H'w'd fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951643.html>
- Meils, C. (2004, July 11). Karlovy Vary tells 'Story'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117907620.html>
- Meils, C. (2004, June 16). Thematic unity marks Karlovy Vary slate. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906564.html>
- Meils, C. (2004, May 31). Karlovy Vary cares about 'Boys'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117905754.html>
- Meza, E. (2004, January 27). Thesps Ling, Potente join Berlin's jury. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917011.html>
- Meza, E. (2004, February 5). Protesters heat up 'Cold' Berlinale bow. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117899634.html?categoryid=1061&cs=1&query=Protesters+heat+up+%27Cold%27+Berlinale+bow>
- Meza, E. (2004, February 11). Trio lighten a dark Berlin. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117899986.html>
- Meza, E. (2004, April 19). Berlinale winner hits Lola noms 'Head-On'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117903498.html?categoryid=19&cs=1>
- Meza, E. (2004, May 13). Pic 'Whisky' a go-go to distrib MK2. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117904855.html>

- Meza, E. (2004, June 16). Teutonic coin trim. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906568.html>
- Meza, E. (2004, November 18). Berlin fest loses Saban. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117913749.html>
- Meza, E. (2004, December 21). Berlin goes ape for 'Man'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915348.html>
- Meza, E. (2004, December 26). Berlin's in the swim. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915440.html>
- Meza, E. (2005, January 4). Off to shorts start. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915735.html>
- Meza, E. (2005, January 25). Berlin's doc block. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916906.html?categoryid=19&cs=1>
- Meza, E. (2005, January 26). Berlin honors own. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916962.html>
- Meza, E. (2005, January 3). Berlin's new reality. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915650.html>
- Meza, E. (2005, January 31). Build up to Berlin. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917189.html?categoryid=1236&cs=1>
- Meza, E. (2005, February 1). Day-Lewis in frame for Berlinale Camera. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917252.html>
- Meza, E. (2005, February 1). Market potential. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917252.html>
- Meza, E. (2005, February 5). Suicidal Tendencies. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917966.html>
- Meza, E. (2005, February 8). Berlin lights up with star power. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917641.html>
- Meza, E. (2005, June 23). Berlin film fest reups Kosslick through '10. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924973.html>

- Meza, E. (2006, December 12). Today Award to kick off Talent Campus. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117955576.html>
- Meza, E. (2006, December 14). Berlin unveils youth, kids' lineup. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117955757.html>
- Meza, E. & James. A. (2005, February 10). Fest shines in rain. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917765.html?categoryid=1061&cs=1&query=Fest+shines+in+rain>
- Miner, J. B. (2006). *Organizational Behavior 3: Historical Origins, Theoretical Foundations, and the Future*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Mitchell-Marell, G. (2004, May 27). Nantucket 'Garden' party. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117905704.html>
- Mohr, I. (2004, October 27). 'Blondie' doc tops N.Y. fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117912616.html>
- Mohr, I. (2004, December 22). 'Bride' marries distrib. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915381.html>
- Mohr, I. (2004, December 27). Diverse acts will 'Dance to fest tune. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915472.html?categoryid=13&cs=1>
- Mohr, I. (2004, December 27). Shorts festival logs on. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915466.html>
- Mohr, I. (2004, December 28). Sundance gets Mohr for its fest 'Dailies'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915511.html?categoryid=14&cs=1>
- Mohr, I. (2005, January 18). 'Hot' energy pumps Slamdance. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117936399.html?categoryid=2086&cs=1>

- Mohr, I. (2005, January 18). Par execs 'Hustle' for hot pic. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117936399.html?categoryid=2086&cs=1>
- Mohr, I. (2005, January 19). Where biz 'Dances with buzz. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916584.html?categoryid=13&cs=1>
- Mohr, I. (2005, February 7). Ebay guru clicks with digital cinema. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917547.html>
- Mohr, I. (2005, March 13). Pix click for Tribeca. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117919315.html>
- Mohr, I. (2005, May 19). Bigtime bankroll. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117923224.html>
- Mohr, I. (2005, June 20). 'Flow' has Nantucket mojo. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924787.html>
- Mohr, I. (2005, June 22). Atlanta film festival on a 'High'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924943.html>
- Mohr, I. (2005, July 10). Had to be fest taps host trio. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925685.html>
- Mohr, I. & Dunkley, C. (2005, January 22). Wheelin' and dealin' in Park City. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916743.html?categoryid=1043&cs=1>
- Mohr, I. & Dunkley, C. (2005, January 24). Weinsteins bullish on 'Matador'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916859.html?categoryid=1975&cs=1>
- Mohr, I. & McClintock, P. (2006, January 23). Film flurry. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/index.asp?layout=features2006&content=jump&jump=story&dept=sundance&nav=NSundance&articleid=VR1117936672&query=film+flurry>

- Morfoot, A. (2004, March 3). DGA gives enough Internet rope. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117901123.html>
- Morfoot, A. (2004, June 27). L.A. fest decorates ‘Soldier’. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117907096.html>
- Morfoot, A. (2004, June 29). Sundance gets in tune. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117907190.html>
- Morfoot, A. (2004, October 31). Telluride gets AMPAS coin. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117912788.html>
- Morfoot, A. (2005, January 16). Fest advisers expand online. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916394.html?categoryid=1009&cs=1>
- Morfoot, A. (2006, December 12). Sundance network screens online. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117955627.html>
- Nesselson, L. (2004, September 6). Deauville fest fetes Spielberg. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910036.html>
- Nesselson, L. (2005, June 19). ‘Petrol’ fuels Avignon. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924721.html>
- Newbery, C. (2004, March 7). Argentina fest sets ‘Moon’ launch. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117901324.html>
- No Author (2005, February 7). ‘Turtles’ flies off with Rotterdam nod. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917537.html>
- Osborne, M. (2004, December 1). Majors invade Asia Media Festival. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117914284.html>
- Paquet, D. (2006, August 27). Mehrjui tops Pusan jury. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117970932.html>
- Paskin, W. (2005, March 16). Think firms up int’l unit. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117919676.html>

- Pearson, B. (2005, February 24). Pakistanis in kiss tizzy. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918456.html?categoryid=1236&cs=1>
- Perrow, C. (1986). *Complex Organizations*. New York: Random House.
- Pincus-Roth, Z. (2004, September 19). Woodstock plays 'Pay', fetes 'Fair's' Nair. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910643.html>
- Powell, D. (1947). The Importance of international film festivals. *Penguin Film Review*, 3, pp. 59-61.
- Rassenfoss, J. (2007, August 8). 5 questions for Liz Langston, co-founder of the 48 Hour Film Project. *Rocky Mountain News*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from http://www.rockymountainnews.com/drmn/movies/article/0,2792,DRMN_23_5663063,00.html, pp. 4-5.
- Repstad, L. (2006, September 28). AFI Fest will honor Cruz. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950913.html>
- Rooney, D. (2004, April 27). NewFest breaks in digs with 'D.E.B.S.'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117903918.html>
- Rooney, D. (2004, March 24). Tribeca fest feasts on \$3 million grant. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.accessmylibrary.com/article-1G1-114782942/tribeca-fest-feasts-3.html>
- Rooney, D. (2004, May 3). Tribeca kicks into gear with pick up. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117904232.html>
- Rooney, D. (2004, May 12). Mouse gives up Moore. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117904784.html>
- Rooney, D. (2004, June 17). Gotham gets '9/11' early. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906647.html>
- Rooney, D. (2004, June 29). New Independent's day. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117907183.html>
- Rooney, D. (2004, July 8). New Yorker's spree. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117907513.html>

- Rooney, D. (2004, September 13). Toronto full of pickup artists. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910369.html>
- Rooney, D. & Amdur, M. (2004, March 25). Tribeca flies British flag. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117902297.html>
- Rooney, D. & Brodesser, C. (2004, May 4). Mouse blocks Moore doc. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117904344.html>
- Rooney, D. & Vivarelli, N. (2004, September 6). Snafus roil Lido waters. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910032.html>
- Rothrock, V. (2005, March 28). Filmart feels good. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117920168.html>
- Rothrock, V. (2005, March 28). Five helmers get H.K. coin. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117920220.html>
- Schilling, M. (2006, August 27). ‘Eagle’ nests at Tokyo festival. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117970937.html>
- Schilling, M. (2006, October 11). NEC opens way to hybrid players. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951709.html>
- Schwarzacher, L. (2004, October 24). Quake shakes Tokyo festival. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117912414.html>
- Schwarzacher, L. (2004, September 13). Miyazaki’s ‘Castle’ finds Tokyo fest slot. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910378.html>
- Schwarzacher, L. & Koehl, C. (2005, January 17). Sealing their deals. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916442.html>
- Shiel, T. & Fitzmaurice, M. (Eds.) (2001). *Cinema and the city: Film and urban societies in a global context*. London: Blackwell Publishers Inc.
- Sneider, J. (2006, October 11). ‘Flower’ to close AFI fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951746.html>
- Snyder, G. (2004, June 15). Pols, polls add twists to ‘9/11’. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906508.html>

- Snyder, G. (2004, June 27). Polemic packs B.O. punch. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117907079.html>
- Snyder, G. (2005, January 2). Auds love 'Company'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915607.html>
- Snyder, G. (2005, January 20). Forston on a Fine Line. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117916656.html?categoryid=13&cs=1>
- Snyder, G. (2005, May 26). U clicks with 'Lips' lad. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117923549.html>
- Snyder, G. (2006, January 31). Oscar buzz payoff. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117937174.html?categoryid=1082&cs=1>
- Sparrow, B. (2006). A research agenda for an institutional media. *Political Communication*, 23(2), pp. 145-157.
- Staff, V. (2004, September 7). Savvy marketing mavens and buzzmakers. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910341.html?categoryid=1771&cs=1>
- Staff, V. (2006, September 28). More foreign Oscar fare. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950864.html>
- Stern, A. (2004, February 23). Fantastic fest to serve 'Fish'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117900594.html>
- Street, D. (1980). Review: The social psychology of organizations by Daniel Katz : Robert L. Kahn, *American Sociological Association*, 9(1), pp. 112-113. Retrieved 5 December, 2009 from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2065620>
- Swart, S. & Mohr, I. (2006). Multiple personalities. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117936430.html?categoryid=2086&cs=1&query=Multiple+personalities>
- Swart, S. (2004, June 10). Moore power to ya!: L.A. fest gets '9/11'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906311.html>

- Sweeting, P. (2005, July 12). Flipping the switch. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925797.html>
- Syers, R., Barker, L. & Watson, S. (2007, September 18). Turning in to the Bin. *Gold Coast Bulletin*, p. 13.
- Thomas, A. (2004, November 4). ‘Tarnation’ takes it. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117913015.html>
- Thomas, A. (2005, February 27). U.K. maps niche net. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918593.html>
- Thomas, A. (2005, May 26). Exhibs go digital via U.K. Film Council. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117923529.html>
- Thomas, A. (2006, October 11). London fest seeks to surprise auds. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951692.html>
- Tillson, T. (2004, April 15). Banff fest bankrupt; event goes on. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117903327.html>
- Tillson, T. (2004, May 3). Hot Docs fetes ‘Gaza’. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117904214.html>
- Tillson, T. (2004, June 15). Ferns hints at a Banff adieu. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906525.html>
- Tillson, T. (2004, June 16). Banff fest to return next year. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117906587.html>
- Tillson, T. (2004, June 29). ‘Julia’ to open Toronto. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117907192.html>
- Tillson, T. (2004, September 15). Dubai taps Canuck relations. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910510.html>
- Tillson, T. (2004, September 19). ‘Hotel’ is toast of Toronto. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910609.html>
- Tillson, T. (2004, September 19). Toronto humming ‘Songs’. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909197.html>

- Tillson, T. (2005, February 2). Docmakers focus on biz at Toronto meet. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917304.html>
- Tillson, T. (2005, February 3). Report: Canuck biz sinking. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917372.html?categoryid=1236&cs=1>
- Tillson, T. (2005, February 28). Runaway prod'n back boosting Toronto biz. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918686.html?categoryid=1279&cs=1>
- Tillson, T. (2005, June 21). Toronto slate plucks best of fests. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924856.html>
- Tillson, T. (2005, June 9). Banff TV fest gets intimate. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924182.html>
- Tillson, T. (2005, July 12). Toronto shining 'Shoes'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925835.html>
- Tillson, T. (2005, July 13). 'Walk' flies to Toronto. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925903.html>
- Tillson, T. (2005, July 20). FIAPF greenlight given to Losique fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117926263.html>
- Tillson, T. (2005, July 20). Jumping on the BANFF wagon. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918234.html>
- Tillson, T. (2005, July 24). Montreal fest cuts 'Loose'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117926435.html>
- Tillson, T. (2006, August 27). TIFFG names its new home. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117970931.html>
- Tillson, T. & Rooney, D. (2004, August 24). Toronto torrent. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909492.html>
- Tizard, W. (2005, February 3). Film panel get funds. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917384.html?categoryid=1237&cs=1>

- Tizard, W. (2005, July 1). Karlovy Vary adds glitz. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925419.html>
- Tizard, W. (2005, July 13). Trio feted at fest. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117924346.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2004, March 3). Venice reels in familiar face. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117901138.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2004, April 15). ‘Terminal’ jetting to Lido. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117903345.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2004, July 26). Tarantino, Dante buzz Venice B’s. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117908267.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2004, August 17). De Niro receives citizenship at Venice. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909190.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2004, August 31). Fest facelift boosts lido. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909855.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2004, September 7). Mifed’s miffed at AFMA ‘pressure’. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910066.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2004, September 17). ‘Drake’ takes cake in Venice. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910293.html?categoryid=19&cs=1>
- Vivarelli, N. (2004, October 3). Mifed’s slow fade. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117911344.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2004, October 14). Mifed’s mixed bag. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117911966.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2005, January 3). Italian film industryites irate at cuts. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915651.html?categoryid=1236&cs=1>
- Vivarelli, N. (2005, February 7). Amelio unlocks Italo prize. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117917533.html?categoryid=1237&cs=1>

- Vivarelli, N. (2005, February 20). Blessing for 'Paradise'. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918221.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2005, March 3). Italy dusts off coin. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918840.html?categoryid=1236&cs=1>
- Vivarelli, N. (2006, October 2). 'Door' open to Oscar. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951132.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2006, October 4). Muller heads to Beirut. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951252.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2006, October 10). Rome eager to host new int'l TV festival. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951624.html>
- Vivarelli, N. (2009, July 20). Italian film folk protest against arts cuts. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1118006193.html?categoryid=13&cs=1>
- Vivarelli, N. & Meza, E. (2005, February 17). Pics click with buyers. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117918148.html>
- Vivarelli, N. & Rooney, D. (2004, September 1). Lido launches with showbiz biggies. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909892.html>
- Wallerstein, C. (2006, October 1). Sitges still fantasies land. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950952.html>
- Walton, A. M. (2005, January 2). Woody pic goes west. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915594.html>
- Walton, A. M. (2005, January 9). Thai fest offers tsunami aid. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117915995.html>
- Whiteman, B. (2004, August 25). European DocuZone links digital sites. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117909572.html>
- Whiteman, B. (2004, September 19). Germans bust up Net pic ring. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910625.html>

- Whiteman, B. (2004, October 14). Record no. of companies at Mipcom. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117911969.html>
- Whiteman, B. (2005, July 5). Globe-trotting Acad woos 91 nations. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117925489.html>
- Willis, H. (1998). Indie influence. In S. Gaydos (Ed.) *The Variety guide to film festivals: The ultimate insider's guide to film festivals around the world*. New York: Berkley Publ. Group, pp. 23-29.
- Willis, H. (2006, January 18). Art meets cinema. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117936413.html?categoryid=2086&cs=1>
- Young, D. (2004, November 22). Argentine fest fires its director. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117913903.html?categoryid=1061&cs=1>
- Young, D. (2006, September 26). San Sebastian - Ghosts. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/review/VE1117931710.html?categoryId=1117931731&cs=1117931711&nid=1117933078>
- Young, D. & Hopewell, J. (2004, September 26). 'Turtles' tops San Sebastian. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117910960.html>
- Zeitchik, S. (2006, October 10). Lynch pins down pic rights. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117951640.html>
- Zeitchik, S. (2006, September 28). 'Shepherd' ushers in Rome-Tribeca pact. *Variety*. Retrieved 5 December, 2009, from <http://www.variety.com/article/VR1117950936.html>

